

CONTROVERSIAL CATECHISM;
OR,
PROTESTANTISM REFUTED,
AND
CATHOLICISM ESTABLISHED,

BY AN APPEAL TO THE
HOLY SCRIPTURES, THE TESTIMONY OF THE HOLY FATHERS,
AND THE DICTATES OF REASON;
IN WHICH SUCH PORTIONS OF
SCHEFFMACHER'S CATECHISM AS SUIT MODERN CONTROVERSY
ARE EMBODIED.

BY THE
REV. STEPHEN KEENAN.

“Try all things, and hold fast that which is good.”—*Thess. v. 21*

THIRD EDITION, CORRECTED BY THE AUTHOR.

Eleventh Thousand.

MARSH AND BEATTIE,
13 SOUTH HANOVER STREET, EDINBURGH.
CHARLES DOLMAN,
LONDON AND MANCHESTER.

CONTROVERSIAL CATECHISM.

CHAPTER I.

REASONS FOR EXAMINING THE CATHOLIC RELIGION.

QUESTION. *Can there be more than one true Church?*

Answer. No; for the Scripture tells, that there is but one faith, as there is but one Lord and one baptism (Ephes. iv. 4, 5); that there is but one fold and one Shepherd (John x. 16); that the children of the Church of Christ should be one, as Christ and the Father are one (John xvii. 20); that we are one body in Christ. (Rom. xii. 5.)

Q. *Is not this truth plain also from other reasons?*

A. Yes; God cannot teach *contradictory doctrines*. There is but one revelation made by him; that revelation can have only one true meaning, and hence that Church only, which gives the true meaning of God's revelation, in teaching her children, can be God's true Church.

Q. *What then would you say to the multitudes who profess so many modern, contradictory creeds?*

A. I would say, according to Scripture and reason, there can be only one true Church. That one is somewhere—search for it—"Try all things, and hold fast that which is best."

Q. *What say you to the man who professes a modern religion, merely because he was born in it, and when he came to the use of reason, found himself a member of it?*

A. I would say, that, on the same principle, a man may be a Jew, a Mahometan, or Pagan, without incurring the displeasure of God.

Q. *What advice would you give those who examine all our modern creeds, but never think of inquiring into the ancient, universal religion of Catholics?*

A. I would, in the first instance, pray for them, because this indifference is the effect of early prejudice, of the impressions left on their minds by incessant misrepresentation; I would then advise them to pray, that God would enable them

to extend their inquiry to Catholicism, since we find truth, often, where we least expect to find it.

Q. Would you add any thing to this admonition?

A. I would tell them to reflect, that the whole world was once Catholic; that their forefathers, till very lately, were all Catholic; that the kings whom they admire for their greatness, the philosophers they admire for their wisdom, and the saints whom they admire for their holiness, were all Catholic.

Q. What if they call all these idolaters?

A. Then, as idolatry is a mortal offence to God, they must reconcile themselves to the awful thought, that the souls of the whole Christian world during fifteen hundred years are now in hell for their idolatries; for, the whole Christian world, during all that period, was Catholic.

Q. What if they say, Catholics are Catholics, because they are unenlightened, unlettered simpletons?

A. Then they must maintain, that the whole world was such, for fifteen hundred years; that Augustine, Jerome, Basil, Leo, Gregory, Tasso, Pope, Dryden, Bourdaloue, Fenelon, Massillon, and ten thousand other such lights, were fools and idiots.

Q. Would you add anything to the above?

A. I would say, as Hume and others have remarked, that, at the time of the Reformation, the most enlightened nations, such as France, Italy, and Spain, remained Catholic, whilst the more barbarous nations of the North embraced Protestantism; and that, even now, when the whole Christian world is enlightened and learned, the greatest part is still Catholic.

Q. Is there any thing to induce us to remain Catholic, but the love of truth, and the most solid conviction that our Church is the only true Church of Christ?

A. No; we have adhered to our faith amidst all imaginable difficulties; our religion in practice is laborious; its duties numerous, painful, yet indispensable; confession, fasting, abstinence, the mortification of every passion, are all, with us, realities, not mere names, as they are with others; indeed, the Sunday and every-day duties of a good Catholic are so laborious, that they would tire the energies of human nature, were it not supported by a divine hand.

Q. Besides the difficulties we have in the practice of our religion, have we had other and greater difficulties to struggle with in our adhesion to Catholicism?

A. Those who read the penal code, containing the laws enacted against Popery during the last three hundred years,

will be quite satisfied, that God alone preserved our faith,—that there is nothing human in our attachment to it.

Q. What have we suffered by some of these laws?

A. The loss of our estates, which were transferred to others; the transfer of our Churches to government preachers, or, as in Scotland, the absolute destruction of these Churches; our Church lands, the patrimony of the poor, given to the corrupt minions of unprincipled governments. Education, either at home or abroad, was forbidden to us under the most severe penalties. Indeed, the persecutions we have suffered for our faith, in these Protestant countries, have been such, that the eloquent Burke says of them: “Never did any thing more savage proceed from the perverted ingenuity of man;” and yet, after all, we are still Catholic; after all, our religion is progressing.

Q. Have we not suffered by misrepresentation, as well as by persecution?

A. Yes; ministers of modern religions have laboured to prevent inquiry into Catholicism, by misrepresenting our creed; according to them, we trust in our own works, not in Christ; we worship the saints; we never read the Scriptures; we believe man to be infallible; we hold that man, *as man*, can forgive sin; we think the Pope can give leave to commit sin, &c. Now all these are simple falsehoods: we believe none of them.

Q. Has not this systematic misrepresentation been very injurious to Catholicism?

A. It has kept the people of these countries, for centuries, from inquiring into the nature of our religion; and it is only of late, that Protestants have learned to penetrate the veil of falsehood our enemies have cast around us; have discovered our real doctrines, and are daily embracing them.

Q. Do not these ministers labour earnestly to impress the public with the notion, that our doctrines are absurd?

A. Yes; and by this have prevented many from inquiring; yet how unfounded is this assertion? If our doctrines are absurd, why are they believed by five-sixths of Christianity? why are the learned the best Catholics? and why is it, that it is the most learned ministers and laity of Oxford and Cambridge, who are daily becoming Catholics? We have converts in every class of society, from the nobleman to the mendicant. The former, by becoming Catholic, has much to endure; and the latter is refused even a cup of cold water, because he has become a member of the Catholic religion; and all this is endured for the sake of our *absurd* doctrines!

Q. Are not attempts made, even now, all over these kingdoms, to seduce the poor, and especially the young, by the offer of food and raiment?

A. Yes; the educated, the instructed, and comfortable Catholic is beyond seduction; and the snare is set by heresy for the hungry and the naked.

Q. Do these seducers succeed even with the poor?

A. No; for no sooner have their poor victims tried the religion of their seducers, than they feel the remark of Dr Johnson: The lacerations of conscience, which they instantly experience, make them hasten back to the altar of their fathers to deplore their apostacy, and implore forgiveness.—*Life of Johnson*, vol. ii., p. 99.

Q. Is there not something very striking in the conversions of the present day?

A. Yes; the most enlightened men of the Protestant Church, even multitudes of her ministers, are crowding, of their own accord, into the Catholic Church; whilst the ignorant and bigotted portion of the Protestant community are labouring hard, but without success, to seduce, not the educated, but the poorest and most ignorant, of the Catholic body.

Q. Is there not something in the Catholic clergy, when compared with the clergy of other persuasions, to induce men to doubt of the reformed religion?

A. Yes; they are an independent body of men, who will not be bought by any worldly advantages. From the Pope to the humblest priest, we find them, not time-servers, or the servants of any government, but boldly denouncing sin, whether it lurk under the purple of the king, or the tattered rags of the beggar.

Q. As men having the care of souls, are they not much more laborious than Protestant ministers?

A. Their lives are one continued toil; they are poor; they are refused by their office every luxury except the most ordinary food and raiment. Their perpetual study and learning; their attention to the sick-bed of every dying Catholic, be he poor or rich; their heavy vestry duty, which compels them to take weekly, monthly, or, at the outside, yearly cognisance of the conscientious state of every Catholic, points them out as men who really have the care of souls. How different is their duty from that of the Presbyterian minister, who has no other spiritual connexion with his flock, than what is derived from the delivery of a dry piece of ethical morality

once or twice a week ! or a hebdomadal lecture against Popery.

Q. Can you give any other reasons to induce a prudent Protestant to doubt of his religion, and to induce him to inquire ?

A. Yes ; many reasons : Our religion existed in the world fifteen hundred years before Protestantism had even a name ; and even our enemies admit that it was founded by Jesus Christ.

Q. But they say, it became corrupted ?

A. Yes ; but if so, then they must maintain, that Christ failed in his word ; for he says, the gates of hell *shall not prevail against it* ; that he will be with his pastors *all days* ; that his Holy Spirit will *teach his Church all truth FOR EVER.* (Math. xvi., xxviii., John xiv.) Nay, he adds, that he died to make her a glorious Church without *spot or wrinkle, holy and without blemish* ; and his Apostle calls her the *pillar and ground of truth.* (Ephes. v., 1 Tim. iii.)

Q. Does he say anything else, which proves the above assertion to be an impiety ?

A. He prays that all who should believe in his name may be one, as he and the Father are one,—a prayer which could not have been heard, if his Church had fallen into error. (John xvii.)

Q. Have you any other reason to induce an honest man to doubt of the reformed religions ?

A. Yes ; to prevent men from being tossed about by every wind of doctrine, and to perfect the elect, Christ appointed, *not the Bible*, as reformers do, but apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and doctors. (Ephes. iv.)

Q. Were there no abuses in the Church before the Reformation ?

A. Yes ; and in every age there were wise and foolish virgins, wheat and cockle blended together. These abuses were the work of individual Catholics ; the faith and moral teaching of the Church were always the same as they are at present.

Q. Have not Protestants reason to doubt of their faith, when they consider the men who founded Protestantism ?

A. Yes, and strong reason. These were men of the most licentious character ; and surely God would never choose such immoral persons to reform a Church established by his divine Son.

Q. When Protestants consider their rule of faith in its result, have they not reason to tremble ?

A. Yes ; for by making every man a judge of the Bible, they have filled the world with jarring and contradictory sects,

each making war on all the rest ; instead of the one united family for which Christ prayed, the one fold and one Shepherd, the most Babylonish disunion, as to folds and shepherds, pervades the entire Protestant world.

Q. Must not a sensible Protestant doubt seriously, when he finds that even the Bible is not followed as a rule by his co-religionists ?

A. Surely, when he sees them baptize infants, abrogate the Jewish Sabbath, and observe Sunday, for which there is no Scriptural authority ; when he finds them neglect to wash one another's feet, which is expressly commanded, and eat blood and things strangled, which are expressly prohibited in Scripture. He must doubt, if he think at all.

Q. Do not the perpetual changes of Protestantism give ground for doubt ?

A. Certainly ; since a changing religion, which assumes a new face both as to faith and morals in every age and every country, cannot be the religion of Christ, which is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever, and the same everywhere.

Q. Should not a wise man doubt of the first principle of Protestantism, when he reads the words of St Peter,—2 Peter i. 20, iii. 16 ?

A. He must not only doubt, but be certain, that the principle of private interpretation is erroneous, since that Apostle says, that *no prophecy is of private interpretation*, and that many things in the Scripture are hard to be understood, *which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction*.

Q. Should not a Protestant doubt, when he finds that he himself, holds tradition as a guide ?

A. Yes ; if he would but reflect, that he has nothing but Catholic tradition for keeping the Sunday holy ; and that, amongst many other things, it is by Catholic tradition only he knows the Bible to be the Word of God.

Q. Is not the Church of Christ one fold ?

A. Yes ; yet not two Protestant sects, are exactly the same ; nay, you will hardly find two Protestants who have the same faith on every point.

Q. Is not the Church of Christ holy, without spot or wrinkle ?

A. Yes ; and whether we consider Protestantism in its founders or in its doctrines, it is not holy. Its founders, as we shall shortly see, were immoral men ; and it held, and now holds, most immoral doctrines ; for example, the doctrine of predestination, from which it follows that God is the author of sin, that man must sin.

Q. Is not the Church of Christ Catholic, or universal ?

A. Certainly; for Christ told his Apostles to *teach all nations*, to teach *all truth*, and that he would be with them *all days*; yet, the Protestant Church has not existed all days, she is only of yesterday; she does not teach all truth, for no two Protestant sects teach the same doctrines; she is not the Church of all nations, nor even of any one entire nation on earth.

Q. *Is not the Church of Christ apostolical as to orders, doctrine, and mission?*

A. Yes; yet Protestants, instead of being able to trace their orders, mission, and doctrine, back to the apostles, can trace them to Luther, but no further; even the English Church has no certainty that its ministers have orders; and as to Calvinists, their ministers are mere laymen.

Q. *What does Cullingworth say on this subject?*

A. He says; that "perpetual visible succession, which could never be wanting to the religion of Christ....is wanting to the Protestant religion."—*Athenæ Oxonienses*, Bliss' edit. vol. iii. col. 86.

Q. *Did Christ say, that his Church would be infallible, that the gates of hell should never prevail against her, that his Holy Spirit would teach her all truth for ever?*

A. Yes; yet all Protestants hold their Church to be fallible.

Q. *Would a wise man remain a member of such a Church?*

A. No, certainly; he might as well be a Pagan: he has no security for salvation, as he has no certainty, whether he is believing truth or error.

Q. *What does Edmund Burke say of the Protestant religion?*

A. That it is "no description of a religion at all, or of any principle, religious, moral, or political, but is a mere negation."—Letter to Dr Lawrence.

Q. *What do eminent Protestants say of the Catholic Church?*

A. Hooker acknowledges the Church of Rome "to be of the Family of Jesus Christ." (Eccles. Polity.) Bishop White says: "He never doubted the Church of Rome to be the visible Church of God, wherein our ancestors did profess the true faith, and were saved." (Defence of his Way.) Dr Barrow admits, that the most learned Protestants have owned the Church of Rome to be the Church of Christ.

Q. *What lesson should a wise, educated Protestant learn from all these reasons?*

A. He should weigh them well; and, in doing so, he will find abundant reason to doubt of his own religion, and powerful inducements to examine the Catholic faith.

Q. How should the sincere, but unlearned Protestant, act in this important matter?

A. As his salvation depends on his being a member of the true Church, and as he sees crowds of learned ministers, induced by the above reasons to sacrifice their worldly prospects, and embrace Catholicism, he should, without delay, commence an earnest inquiry after truth. No worldly interest should be allowed to deter him from professing what his head and his heart command him to embrace as truth.

CHAPTER II.

THE RISE AND PROGRESS OF PROTESTANTISM, (*Drawn from the Works of Luther himself.*)

SECTION I.

Q. What is Protestantism?

A. A new religion, invented and propagated by a person called Luther.

Q. Why do you call it a new religion?

A. Because, viewing it as a body of doctrine, no such divinity, either as to faith or morals, was ever known, taught, or believed, by any sect in the world, until Luther's time.

Q. Was not the same divinity taught some centuries earlier by the Albigenses, Waldenses, Hussites, and Wickliffites?

A. No; these sects professed errors of a very different kind. The Albigenses taught that there were two Gods and two Christs; they reprobated marriage, denied all the Sacraments, as well as the resurrection of the body. The Waldenses aimed at plunder; they declared it a heinous sin for a magistrate to condemn to death for any crime; according to them, it was a mortal sin to take an oath; the clergy became reprobates by holding one farthing's worth of property. In other things these deluded fanatics were Catholic; they held the Sacraments, Mass, Transubstantiation, and Purgatory, &c. The Wickliffites maintained; that man must sin, that God approves of sin; yet, with evident inconsistency, they declared that all power, whether of the priest or magistrate, is forfeited by the commission of one mortal sin; they concluded, that as they themselves were all free from sin, so all power belonged to them. As to the Hussites, their doctrines were those of Wickliffe, their principles were seditious and unchristian, and plunder was their object.

Q. Did Luther and his reforming brotherhood teach nothing in common with the Christian Church then existing?

A. A few of the great leading truths were still retained; but there is scarcely one article of the Christian faith which was not denied and rejected by one or other of the reformers.

Q. In what year was Luther born?

A. In 1483.

Q. Where was he born?

A. In Eisleben, of Prussian Saxony.

Q. Of what religion were his parents?

A. They were Catholics, and so were all his ancestors.

Q. At the time Luther was born, what was the religion of all Europe?

A. All believed what Catholics believe at the present time.

Q. Was Luther himself a Catholic for any time?

A. He was a Catholic until his thirty-fifth year.

Q. What was his state of life?

A. He was a monk of the order of discoloured Augustinians.

Q. As such, had he made religious vows?

A. At the age of twenty-three years, he made vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience.

Q. Was he bound to keep these vows?

A. Without doubt, since he made them after mature reflection, and of his own free will; because the Prophet says (Ps. xlix.): "Pay thy vows to the Most High;" and God himself says (Num. chap. xxx.): "If any man make a vow to the Lord, or bind himself by an oath; he shall not make his word void, but shall fulfil all that he promised."

Q. Did Luther obey this command of God by keeping his vows?

A. No; he violated all the three; he apostatized,—he married Catherine de Boré, a nun, like himself under vows,—and he positively disobeyed every ecclesiastical authority.

Q. Was this man in reality the founder of the Protestant religion, and the first of that sect that ever appeared in the world?

A. Most certainly; for no minister, no congregation, no body of divines, professing Protestant doctrines, were ever heard of, until his time.

Q. What inference do you draw from all this?

A. That Protestantism cannot be the religion of Christ, because, if the Church of Christ required reformation, a God of purity and holiness, would never have chosen such an immoral character—an apostate, a wholesale vow-breaker, a sacrilegious seducer—for that purpose.

SECTION II.

Q. What was it that induced Luther to attack the ancient Catholic faith, and invent a new creed?

A. Pride and jealousy. Pope Leo having granted an Indulgence, Luther's pride was mortified, because the commission to preach that Indulgence was given to the order of St Dominic.

Q. To what did he allow himself to be driven by this pride and jealousy?

A. To attack in itself the doctrine of Indulgences.

Q. Would the Catholic Church have blamed Luther had he merely attacked the abuses or avarice of individual Catholics?

A. No, certainly. He erred in this, that, under pretence of reprehending abuses, he assailed the true faith, on the subject of Indulgences.

Q. What was his next step?

A. He posted on the gates of the Church of Wittenberg ninety-five articles, which we wrote, and which contained many things not in accordance with the doctrines of the Church.

Q. Were these articles refuted?

A. They were, and with much cleverness, by some Catholic Theologians, to whom Luther replied with a haughty insolence unworthy of a Christian.

Q. What hypocritical pretences did Luther make in 1517, during these disputes?

A. He pretended that he wished to teach nothing but what was conformable to Scripture, to the Holy Fathers, and approved by the Holy See. (T. 1. Ger. Edit. Gen. p. 12.)

Q. What did he write to Jerome, Bishop of Brandenburg?

A. That he wished to decide nothing himself, and that he wished to submit all his doctrines to the Church. (Ibid, p. 54.)

Q. What did he write to Pope Leo in 1518?

A. That he would listen to that Pope's decision as to an oracle proceeding from the mouth of Jesus Christ. (Ibid, p. 58.)

Q. What did he promise to his religious superiors?

A. That he would be silent, if his adversaries were placed under the same restraint.

Q. What inference do you draw from all this?

A. That he was either a hypocrite, who did not intend to fulfil his promises, or that he was quite satisfied of the truth of the doctrines which he impugned, since otherwise he could not conscientiously promise silence and obedience.

Q. What other consequences do you draw?

A. That a man bursting with pride, envy, jealousy—a disobedient hypocrite—was not the person to be chosen by God to reform abuses, if any such existed.

SECTION III.

Q. *What took place at Augsburg between Luther and Cardinal Cajetan?*

A. The Cardinal required of him, that he should retract his errors, which Luther refused, appealing at the same time to the most celebrated Universities of Germany, and to that of Paris, and pledging himself most humbly to submit to their decision. (Ibid, p. 119 and p. 14.)

Q. *Did he stand by that appeal?*

A. No; he appealed a short time after to the Pope. (Ibid, p. 122.)

Q. *Did he abide by this second appeal?*

A. No.; he next appealed from the Pope ill-informed to the Pope well-informed. (Ibid, p. 205.)

Q. *Did he stop even here?*

A. No; he then appealed to a General Council. (Ibid, p. 351.)

Q. *Did he abide by this resolution to submit to the decision of a General Council?*

A. No; at the Diet of Worms, he declared flatly that he would not submit his doctrine to any Council. (Ibid, pp. 448, 450, 452.)

Q. *What do you conclude from such conduct?*

A. In the first place, that Luther must have been extremely fickle to appeal to so many judges, and to abide by the decision of none. Secondly, that he knew his cause was bad and his doctrine false, since he would not submit it even to the best judges. Thirdly, that he must have been brimful of sinful pride and obstinacy, since he preferred his own single judgment to that of the whole Christian world.

Q. *But did not Luther promise to abandon his errors, if any one would prove them such from Scripture?*

A. Yes; but this was only an artifice to enable him more freely to propagate them; because he well knew that the Scriptures may be wrested into any, or every meaning; that he could give them any sense he pleased, as the Mormons, the Muckers, the Methodists, and the Free-Kirkmen do at the present day: the Scripture is made to teach all sorts of contradictions.

Q. *What was his real object in this subterfuge?*

A. He wished to impose his monstrous errors on the public, as truths, bearing the sacred stamp of Scriptural authority.

Had he been sincere in his appeal, he would have said: I shall leave it to the Church to decide whether my doctrine is conformable to the Scripture or not.

Q. What judgment did the Universities, to which Luther appealed, pronounce upon his doctrine?

A. They condemned his doctrine as false and heretical. (Ibid, p. 539.)

Q. What Universities did so?

A. The Universities of Leipsie, Cologne, Louvain, and Paris.

Q. Did Luther abide, as he had promised, by their decision?

A. No; on the contrary, he poured forth a torrent of invectives and insults against them; he called the University of Paris the mother of errors, the daughter of Antichrist, the gate of hell. (Ibid, p. 548.)

Q. What was the judgment of the Pope, to whom Luther appealed, and whose decisions he promised to receive, as if they came from the mouth of Christ himself?

A. The Pope published a Bull, condemning forty-one articles of Luther's doctrine.

Q. What does the Pope say in that Bull?

A. That he had done every thing he could, to reclaim Luther, but that all his paternal cares and advices had been unavailing. He gives Luther sixty days to retract, and orders his works to be burned at the expiry of that period, should he persist in his errors.

Q. Did Luther submit?

A. No; he now renounces the authority, to which he had appealed; he writes against the Bull of his chief Superior, whom he had vowed to obey; he denounces the Papal decision as the decision of Antichrist (Ibid, p. 345); he publicly burns the Bull, along with the book of Decretals. (Ibid, p. 353.)

Q. Had Luther previously written, in the most submissive terms, declaring that he was willing to cast himself at the feet of his Holiness?

A. Yes (Ibid, p. 58); but the moment the Pope opposed him, he changed his language, declaring that not only the Bull, but the Pope himself should be burned. (Ibid, p. 553.)

Q. Had Luther not written, a little before, that his preservation or destruction depended entirely on the absolution or condemnation of his Holiness? (Ibid, p. 53.)

A. Yes; but he now declares, that men must take up arms against the Pope, the Cardinals, and Bishops, and wash their hands in the blood of these dignitaries. (Ibid, p. 60.) "Why," says he, "do not we fall on those masters of per-

dition, the Popes, Cardinals, and Bishops, with all our force, and not give over, till we have bathed our hands in their blood?" (Ad Silvest. Pereir.) "If you fall," he elsewhere adds, "before the Beast has received its mortal wound, you will have but one thing to be sorry for, That you did not bury your dagger in its breast. All that defend him must be treated like a band of robbers, be they kings or be they Cæsars." (Thesis. apud Sleid. A.D. 1545.)

Q. *Had he not written, before this time, that the Pope and the Catholic Church were the highest spiritual authority on earth?* (Ibid, p. 144.)

A. Yes; but he now teaches, that none but those who oppose the Papal authority can be saved. (Ibid, p. 553.)

Q. *What do you now think of Luther's conduct?*

A. I can discover nothing in it but the spirit of inconstancy, doubt, error, and revenge, without even the slightest mark of the spirit of God. He seems solely actuated by the spirit of the devil.

SECTION IV.

Q. *What did the secular power do, to suppress the rising heresy?*

A. The Emperor Charles V. cited Luther to appear before the Diet of Worms, and sought to reclaim him by the mildest means.

Q. *What reply did Luther make to the order of the Emperor?*

A. He replied, that from the wording of the order, one would suppose the Emperor to be either a maniac or a demoniac. (Ibid, p. 460.)

Q. *Why was not Luther confined, to prevent him from corrupting others, and from exciting disturbance?*

A. He had received the assurance of a safe-conduct, and the civil authorities could not break their promise. When, however, the term of the safe-conduct had expired, the Emperor proscribed Luther as a sectarian, cut off from the body of the Church.

Q. *Whither did Luther then retire?*

A. To the Castle of Wirtemberg, where he wrote the most false and pernicious works.

Q. *What was the effect of these works, in which he spoke of nothing but evangelical liberty?*

A. These works produced disturbances, sedition, and, amongst other evils, the German War of the Peasants, who committed every sort of excess, declaring that the rich had no exclusive right to their properties, that every thing should be held in common, because in the 2d chapter of the Acts, it

is said, that all property was common amongst the first Christians.

Q. Did other divisions and schisms soon appear amongst Lutherans?

A. Yes; each disciple of Luther thought he had as good a right as his master to expound the Scripture according to his own peculiar fancy: Carlostad, Zwinglius, Calvin, Munceer, Schwenckfeld, were of this opinion. They interpreted for themselves, denounced their master, and opened religious hucksteries for themselves.

Q. Did the religion, invented by Luther, continue thus to give rise to new and different sects?

A. Ycs; every year gave rise to *some new one*,—a short period produced thirty-four different sects: and even to this day, the religion of Luther is as prolific as ever: witness the Mormons and the Free Kirk. So true is it, that when we once abandon truth, there can be no end to our wanderings in the mazes of error; that when we once break the moorings which bind us to the rock of truth, by the adoption of a false principle, such as that of private interpretation, we are only the prey of endless, ever-varying, erroneous *human* opinions,—tossed to and fro on a wide ocean of contradictions and contrarieties,—to-day on one tack, to-morrow upon another,—certain of nothing, but ultimate shipwreck on the rock of infidelity, or the quicksands of heresy and schism. Calvinism is now running fast into Socinianism and Socialism; and three lawyers, professing different Creeds, settle all articles of faith for Luther's English Church; and this decision is binding, if a Lay Lady concur in it, but not otherwise. Shame! Shame!! Shame!!! Three Lawyers and a Lady to teach Bishops what they are to believe!

Q. What lesson do you learn from this portion of Luther's conduct?

A. That the man who wilfully disobeys all his superiors, both ecclesiastical and civil—the man who perverts the sacred Scripture, for the purpose of exciting sedition, and propagating evident heresy and schism—cannot possibly be the ambassador of Heaven.

SECTION V.

Q. What means did Luther resort to, for the purpose of supplying his new church with priests, seeing that no bishop could, or would, ordain any of his followers?

A. He invented a new doctrine on that subject, a doctrine never known in the Church, till his time.

Q. What was that doctrine?

A. That all Christians—men, women, and children, even infants—were truly and really priests, and that nothing was wanting to them but presentation to a charge. (*Ibid*, pp. 64, 336, 369.)

Q. Upon what did he found this unheard-of doctrine?

A. Upon that passage of St Peter, "You are a *royal* priesthood." "St Peter," he reasoned, "addresses this to all Christians, therefore all Christians are priests." He might equally well have proved, from the same passage, that all Christians are *kings*; since St Peter declares that they are all ROYAL. Hence, as all Christians are confessedly not kings, so neither are they all priests. Hence, again, all the followers of Luther should be satisfied, that their pretended pastors are only wolves in sheep's clothing, who entered the fold, not by the door, but over the wall, since their pretended orders and mission are founded upon a passage of Scripture evidently perverted to suit a purpose.

Q. What was Luther's next step, after abolishing the true priesthood amongst his followers?

A. He next abolished the true Sacrifice.

Q. What did he allege against the sacrifice of the Mass?

A. Various things, which he learned from the devil, as he himself declares.

Q. How does he express himself on that subject in his book on the Mass? (*Tom*. vi. p. 82.)

A. "Having awoke," he says, "about midnight, the devil commenced a dispute with me on the subject of the Mass."

Q. What did the devil say to him?

A. "Listen, most sapient doctor," said the father of lies: "during fifteen years, you have said Mass almost every day. What if all these acts, have been only so many acts of idolatry?"

Q. Did Luther hearken to the paternal advice of his sable director?

A. He listened so well, that he allowed himself to be persuaded that the devil was right and he wrong, so that the enemy of man came off victor; and though Luther, in the same book, calls the devil, the most artful and lying deceiver, he here chose to follow the advice of the devil, rather than that of the Church.

Q. What think you of all this?

A. One can hardly tell at which to be most astonished,—at the open and brazen avowal of Luther, or, at the awful blindness of those who follow a master, who, by his own

account, received his training and instruction in the school of Satan.

CHAPTER III.

THE PRETENDED REFORMATION IS NOT THE WORK OF GOD.

SECTION I.

Q. Can any one reasonably believe, that the change in religion brought about by Luther, is the work of God?

A. No one can believe it, unless he be utterly ignorant of the true nature of religion, and very illiterate in matters of history.

Q. Why do you make this answer?

A. Because, in the first place, the author of the Reformation is not a man of God; secondly, because his work is not the work of God; thirdly, because the means which he used in effecting his purpose, are not of God.

Q. Why do you say Luther is not a man of God?

A. Because he has left us, in his works, abundant proof that, if God saw need for any reformation in his Church, such a man as Luther would not be selected to carry God's will into effect.

Q. What have you to blame in Luther's works?

A. They are full of indecencies very offensive to modesty, crammed with a low buffoonery well calculated to bring religion into contempt, and interlarded with very many gross insults to individuals of dignity and respectability.

Q. What does Luther say of himself?

A. That, when he was a Catholic, he fasted and watched and prayed, he was poor, chaste, and obedient; but when he became reformer, his heart was a prey to the most shameful passions, which he would not resist. (Vol. v. c. 1. ad Galat. chap. v. 14; Serm. on Matrim., *ibid*, p. 119.) He declared, that he would yield to neither emperor, nor king, nor devil; no, not even to the whole universe. (Respon. ad Maled. g. Angliæ.)

What said his brother reformers of him?

That he was absolutely furious, that he impugned the known truth even against the reclamations of his own conscience. (Hospinian.) That he was puffed up with pride and arrogance, and seduced by Satan. (Ecolamp.) "How

dare you," said Henry the VIII., "O Luther, lift your eyes before God or man, after having allowed yourself to be borne away by your concupiscence at the instigation of the devil." (Florimond; p. 299.)

Q. *What says the Church of Zurich against Luther?* (Confess. p. 61.)

A. It says, he is borne away by his devils; his tongue is filthy and full of devils; all his works are written at the impulse of the devil. Erasmus says, in his letter to Luther (1626): "All good people lament the schism with which your arrogant, unbridled, and seditious spirit, rends the world."

Q. *Passing over his indecencies in silence, give us a specimen of his buffooneries and insults. What does he say to the King of England, replying to a book which the King had written against him?* (Tom. ii. p. 145.)

A. He calls the King an ass, an idiot, a fool, whom very infants ought to mock.

Q. *How does he treat Cardinal Albert, Archbishop and Elector of Mayence, in the work which he wrote against the Bishop of Magdeburg?* (Tom. vii. p. 353.)

A. He calls him an unfortunate little priest, crammed with an infinite number of devils.

Q. *What does he say of Henry, Duke of Brunswick?* (Tom. vii. p. 118.)

A. That he had swallowed so many devils in eating and drinking, that he could not even spit any thing but a devil. He calls Duke George of Saxony, a man of straw, who, with his immense belly, seemed to bid defiance to Heaven, and to have swallowed up Jesus Christ himself. (Tom. ii. p. 90.)

Q. *Was Luther's language more respectful, when he addressed the Emperor and the Pope?*

A. No; he treated them both with equal indignities; he said that the Grand Turk had ten times the virtue and good sense of the Emperor,—that the Pope was a wild beast, a ravenous wolf, against whom all Europe should rise in arms.

Q. *What do you conclude from Luther's insolent, outrageous, and libertine manner of speaking, and from his character, drawn by himself and his reforming brethren?*

A. That he was not the man to be chosen by God to reform his Church; for his language is the strongest proof that he was actuated, not by the Spirit of God, but by the spirit of the devil.

Q. *May not his party say, that they care little about the manner of the man, if his doctrine be true,—that it is not upon him, but upon the word of God, they build their faith?*

A. If the Protestant doctrine be true, then God used Luther as a chosen instrument to re-establish his true faith; but no reasonable man can possibly believe the latter; therefore, neither can any reasonable man believe that the Protestant is the true faith.

Q. *May it not be objected that there were individual pastors in the Catholic Church as worthless as Luther?*

A. Yes; but all the pastors of the Catholic Church were not so at one and the same time; there were a hundred good for one bad pastor; whilst Luther, at the time we speak of, was the first and only teacher of Protestantism. Besides, Christ himself gives an unanswerable reply to the objection (Matt. xxiii): "The Scribes and Pharisees have sitten on the chair of Moses; all things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do, but according to their works do ye not." Again, some Catholic pastors may have been bad men, but still they were the lawful ministers of God, having succeeded to lawfully commissioned predecessors; but Luther stood alone, he succeeded to no one having lawful authority, from whom he could derive a mission. In fine, whatever may have been the lives of some vicious Catholic pastors, they taught nothing new, their teaching was what the best and holiest ministers of the Church taught. Hence, there was no innovation in matters of faith, or principles of morality. But Luther was the first, to teach a new doctrine, unknown in the world before his time.

SECTION II.

Q. *We are now satisfied that the author of Protestantism was not a man of God; show us, that his undertaking was not from God?—what did he undertake?*

A. He undertook to show that the Church had fallen into error, he separated himself from her, and formed his followers into a party against her.

Q. *Could such an undertaking be from God?*

A. No; for God has commanded us, not to sit in judgment upon the Church, but to hear and obey her with respect; "and if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican." (Matt. chap. xviii.)

Q. *Was it the particular territorial Church of the Roman States, or the Universal Catholic Church, that Luther charged with having erred?*

A. It was the Universal Church, he dared to calumniate in this manner.

Q. *How do you prove this?*

A. Before the time of Luther, there was no Christian society

in the whole world, which believed the doctrines afterwards taught by Luther; consequently, he assailed not any particular sect or church, but the faith of the whole Christian world.

Q. *Are you quite sure, that it is incontestably true, that no Christian body ever believed, before Luther's time, the new doctrines he began then to propagate?*

A. So sure, that we have Luther's own authority for it. His words are (Tom. ii. p. 9): "How often has not my conscience been alarmed? How often have I not said to myself:—*Dost thou ALONE of all men pretend to be wise? Dost thou pretend that ALL CHRISTIANS have been in error, during such a long period of years.*

Q. *What was it that gave Luther most pain, during the time he meditated the introduction of his new religion?*

A. A hidden respect for the authority of the Church, which he found it impossible to stifle.

Q. *How does he express himself on this matter?* (Tom. ii. p. 5.)

A. "After having subdued all other considerations, it was with the utmost difficulty I could eradicate from my heart the feeling that *I should obey the Church.*" "I am not so presumptuous," said he, "as to believe, that it is in God's name I have commenced and carried on this affair; I should not wish to go to judgment, *resting on the fact that God is my guide in these matters.*" (Tom. i. p. 364.) He evidently had a conscience, but pride was its ruler.

Q. *What think you of the schism caused by Luther? Can one prudently believe that it is the work of God?*

A. No; because God himself has forbidden schism as a dreadful crime. St Paul (1 Cor. i. 10) says: "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you all speak the *same thing*, and that there be no SCHISMS among you; but that you be *perfect in the same mind and same judgment.*"

Q. *What idea did Luther himself entertain about schism before he blinded himself by his infuriated antipathy to the Pope?*

A. He declared, that it was not lawful for any Christian whatever to separate himself from the Church of Rome.

Q. *Repeat the very words of Luther touching this important matter?* (Tom. i. p. 116.)

A. "There is no question, no matter how important, which will justify a separation from the Church." Yet, notwithstanding, he himself burst the moorings which bound him to the Church, and, with his small band of ignorant and reckless followers, opposed her by every means in his power.

Q. What do you remark, on historical examples of conduct similar to this, ever since the birth of Christianity?

A. That in every age, when a small body detached itself from the Church, on account of doctrinal points, it has been universally the case, that the small body plunged by degrees deeper and deeper into error and heresy; and, in the end, brought by its own increasing corruption into a state of decomposition, disappeared and perished. Of this we have hundreds of examples; nor can Lutherans or Calvinists reasonably hope, that their heresy and schism can have any other end. They are walking in the footsteps of those who have strayed from the fold of truth,—from the unity of faith; and they can have no other prospect than that, of so many heresies, that have gone before them.

SECTION III.

Q. Why have you said, that the means adopted by Luther, to establish his new religion, were not of God? What were those means?

A. That he might secure followers, he employed such means as were calculated to flatter the passions of men; he strewed the path to heaven—not like Christ with *thorns*, but like the devil—with *flowers*; he took off the *cross* which Christ had laid on the shoulders of men; he made *wide* and *easy* the way, which Christ had left *narrow* and *difficult*.

Q. Repeat some of Luther's improvements upon the religion of Christ?

A. He permitted all, who had made solemn vows of chastity, to violate their vows and marry; he permitted temporal sovereigns, to plunder the property of the Church; he abolished confession, abstinence, fasting, and every work of penance and mortification.

Q. How did he attempt to tranquillize the consciences he had disturbed by these scandalously libertine doctrines?

A. He invented a thing, which he called justifying faith, to be a sufficient substitute for all the above painful religious works,—an invention which took off every responsibility from our shoulders, and laid all on the shoulders of Jesus Christ; in a word, he told men to believe in the merits of Christ as *certainly applied to them*, and live as they pleased, to indulge every criminal passion, without even the restraints of modesty.

Q. How did he strive, to gain over to his party a sufficient number of presumptuous, unprincipled, and dissolute men of talent, to preach and propagate his novelties?

A. He pandered to their passions, and flattered their pride, by granting them the sovereign honour, of being their own

judges in every religious question; he presented them with the Bible, declaring that each one of them, ignorant and learned, was perfectly qualified to decide upon every point of controversy.

Q. What did he condescend to do for Philip, Landgrave of Hesse, in order to secure his support and protection?

A. He permitted him to keep two wives at one and the same time. The name of the second was Margaret de Saal, who had been maid of honour to his lawful wife, Christina de Saxe. Nor was Luther the only Protestant Doctor who granted this monstrous dispensation from the law of God; eight of the most celebrated Protestant leaders signed, with their own hands, the filthy and adulterous document.

Q. Does the whole history of Christianity furnish us with even one such scandalous dispensation derived from ecclesiastical authority?

A. No; nor could such brutal profligacy be countenanced even for a moment, seeing that the Scripture is so explicit on the subject. Gen. ii. Matth. xix. Mark x. speak of two in one flesh, but never of three. But Luther and his brethren were guided, not by the letter of the Scripture, but by the corrupt passions, wishes, and inclinations of men. To induce their followers to swallow the new creed, they gave them, in return, liberty to gratify every appetite.

SECTION IV.

Q. It is now quite clear, that Luther was not sent by God to reform the Church; is this also true of the other reformers? What say you of Calvin?

A. "What man," says Rousseau, "was ever more impetuous, more divinely infallible than Calvin, who looked upon opposition as the work of Satan, and a crime which made one deserve to be burned alive."

Q. What says Walner of him?

A. He says: "Calvin, I know, is violent and perverse; so much the better, he is just the man, we require, to attain our

Q. What does Calvin himself say in his letter to the Marquess du Poet?

A. He says: "Do not fail to rid the country of those, who exhort the people to rise against us,...monsters of that kind should be suffocated, as I did to Michael Servetus." (Original Letter—Archives of the Marquess Montèlimart.)

Q. What says the reformer Stancharus de Mediat. in Calv Institut., No. 4?

A. "What demon," says he, "has induced you, O Calvin,

to declaim with Arius against the Son of God? Is it that Antichrist of the North whom you adore?" Be on your guard, Christian reader, and you, above all, ministers of God, against the books of Calvin; they contain impious doctrine, the blasphemies of Arianism, as if the spirit of Servetus, escaping from the funeral pile, had passed whole and entire into Calvin. (Ibid, No. 3.)

Q. *What says the Lutherans of Germany (Corp. doct. Christianæ) of Calvin's doctrine, which makes God the author of sin?*

A. That it ought to be, for every one, an object of horror and execration; that it is a madness, the ruin of morals, monstrous and blasphemous. Bullinger, himself a reformer, proves, from the Scripture, the Fathers, and the testimony of the whole Church, the falsehood of this doctrine of Calvin (Decad. iii. Serm. 10.)

Q. *What say the English reformed Bishops on Calvinism?*

A. They protest before God, that Calvin and his disciples, perverted every text of Scripture they quoted in favour of their Church of Geneva. (Survey of Pretended Holy Discipline, p. 44.)

Q. *Was Calvin accused of shockingly immoral practises?*

A. Yes; and it is said he bore the penal mark of these. Nay, the Church of Geneva, after being aware of the charge, did not even deny it, when made at Noyon against him, by Berthelier. After a judicial trial, his sentence was commuted into branding, instead of burning. (Campion and Card. Richelieu.)

Q. *What says Calvin about Luther's doctrine?*

A. That it was much better to *build a new Church* altogether than remain like Luther—a half Papist. (Theol. lib. ii. p. 126.) He calls the Lutheran Church a pig-sty; and he styles Westphal, a great animal—a dog—and a fool. Such is the head and founder of the Presbyterian or Calvinistic Church.

Q. *How did Calvin die?*

A. A disciple of his own says: "Calvin ended his life in despair,...of that shameful and loathsome disease with which God threatens the rebellious and accursed." "This I can attest, as I saw *with my own eyes* his dreadful and tragical end." (Feller. art. Calvin.) "God," say the Lutherans of Germany, "manifested his judgments on Calvin, whom he visited horribly by punishments, before his unhappy death: he so struck the heretic, that, despairing of salvation, and invoking devils, swearing and blaspheming, he breathed forth his malignant soul." (Conrad Schlus. in Theol. Calv. lib. ii. p. 72.)

SECTION V.

Q. What says Melancthon on the character of Carlostadt ?

A. He says he was a brutal man, devoid of talent or knowledge, who, so far from seeming to have the Spirit of God, neither knew nor practised the duties of civilised life. He bore evident marks of impiety, his doctrine was either Judaism or sedition, he condemned all laws made by Pagans, and made the law of Moses his only rule ; when Nicholas Stork began to publish the Anabaptist fanaticism, Carlostadt adopted it ; like Luther, he violated his vow of celibacy by a sacrilegious marriage. (See Prayer for his Marriage in Florim.)

Q. What say the Lutherans of him ? (Hist. Conf. August. fol. 41.)

A. It cannot be denied, say they, that he was strangled by the devil, as so many witnesses have attested it, and so many authors have given it a place in their writings. His son, who survived him, returned to the bosom of the Church.

Q. What does Zwinglius say of himself ?

A. That he was consumed by an unholy and incontinent fire, which had drawn upon him the reproach of the Churches, (Parenoes. ad Helvet. T. i. p. 113.)

Q. What says Luther of Zwinglius and his book ?

A. "I do not," says he, "read the books of such men. They are out of the Church, are not only damned themselves, but are bringing other miserable wretches to perdition. (Schlussemb. lib. ii.) "Zwinglius," he says again, "is dead and damned." (T. ii. p. 36.) "We have no communion," say the Lutherans, "with the Zwinglians ; they are actuated by the spirit of falsehood, and speak blasphemies against the Son of God." (See Epit. Colloq. 1564. p. 28.)

SECTION VI.

Q. The German reformers were not then messengers of heaven, but emissaries from a very different quarter ; is this also true of the leading English and Scottish reformers ? What say you of Crommer ?

A. He was chief adviser to Henry VIII., the greatest monster that ever disgraced Christianity, in all the sacrileges and murders he committed : his name should be everlastingly execrated. The cold blooded, perfidious, impious, blasphemous caitiff expired amidst the flames he had himself kindled. (Cobbett, Letter ii. n. 64. Hist. Reform.)

Q. How did this first Protestant Archbishop prepare himself for consecration ?

A. By committing perjury : before going to the altar, where he had, in the usual way, to swear obedience to the Pope, he

went into a chapel, and there swore, that he would not keep the oath to the Pope, if it prevented him from *helping* the King to *reform*, that is, to plunder the Church. (Ibid, let. ii. n. 65.)

Q. *How did Cranmer behave as to the divorce of Henry?*

A. Knowing that the King was already *married* to Ann Boleyn, and that the intercourse between them was incestuous and adulterous, he, with matchless hypocrisy and impudence, *as head of the Church*, pronounced a divorce against the lawful wife, Queen Catherine; and thus, *for the good of the King's soul*, permitted him to live on, in the most abandoned state. (Ibid.)

Q. *What did this Cranmer do shortly after?*

A. He annulled this very marriage, which he had declared valid, and declared the fruit of it illegitimate; and this he did in the *name of Christ*, and *for the honour of God*. (Ibid, p. 76.)

Q. *Had this wicked man been a priest?*

A. Yes; and he had, notwithstanding his vow, one wife in Germany alive, and another in England. (Ibid, letter iii. n. 104.)

Q. *Was Cranmer a persecutor?*

A. He aided Henry in all his robberies and murders. "These horrid butcheries," says Cobbett (ibid, n. 98), "were perpetrated under the primacy of Craumer, and by the help of another ruffian named Thomas Cromwell, who shared with Cranmer the work of plunder, and afterwards shared in his disgraceful end."

Q. *Did Cranmer pronounce another divorce in favour of the King?*

A. The King had married Ann of Cleves; he soon disliked her, and wished to have Catherine Howard; Cranmer again sat in judgment for the *good of Henry's soul*, and declared the King and Queen single people again. (Ibid, letter vii. n. 188.)

Q. *When Henry died, had Cranmer sworn to see his will executed?*

A. Yes; and he violated that oath in various ways shortly after. In the midst of which perjuries, he had the hypocrisy to attend a solemn High Mass. (Ibid, n. 195, 196.)

Q. *What took place after the High Mass?*

A. The cream had been taken by the wife-killing King Henry, by the plunder of the monasteries; the skimmed milk remained for Cranmer and the Protector. These declared the Catholic religion false and wicked; they had crowned Edward as a Catholic; they had taken the oaths as Catholics; they

had sworn to uphold that religion; they had taken the King to High Mass; and now, as a *necessary consequence*, they combine to plunder the altars, the parish churches, and, above all, the cathedrals. (Ibid, n. 196, 197.)

Q. *What was the next move of this prince of hypocrites, Cranmer?*

A. He had, during the reign of Henry, condemned people to the flames for NOT BELIEVING Transubstantiation; now, he condemns them for *believing it*. He filled England with foreign traders in religion. Perhaps the world has never, in any age, seen a nest of such atrocious miscreants as Luther, Calvin, Zwinglius, Beza: every one of them was notorious for the most scandalous vices. The consequences to the morals of the people were terrible; all historians agree that vice and crimes of all sorts were never so great or so numerous before. (Ibid, 199, 200, 201.)

Q. *What did this founder of English Protestantism do when Edward died?*

A. He invited Mary and Lady Jane to London to *console* their brother, whilst he really intended to *put both into prison*. A secret messenger was sent to Mary to give her hope, and yet Lady Jane is proclaimed Queen; and Cranmer orders Mary to submit as a *dutiful subject*; yet, after all, this miscreant band, in a few days after, actually proclaim Mary Queen. Cranmer, the master-plotter against Mary, actually now tossed his cap into the air, as an expression of his joy that Mary was Queen. No reign, no age, no country, ever witnessed rapacity, hypocrisy, meanness, perfidy, such as England witnessed in those who were the destroyers of the Catholic, and the founders of the Protestant Church. (Ibid, n. 219, 220, 221.)

Q. *What now took place as regards Cranmer?*

A. His sentence of divorce, and his Protestant religion, were both upset, and this, by the very parliament which had confirmed the one and established the other. Cranmer is confined, and hearing, that Mass is celebrated in his cathedral, he writes an inflammatory address, for which he is committed to the Tower. (Ibid, 226.)

Q. *What now happened to Cranmer?*

A. Brought at last to trial and condemnation, he proposed to recant all his errors; he signed six *different forms of recantation*. He, who had established it, declared now that the Protestant religion was false; that the Catholic religion, which he now believed, was the only true religion; that he had been a horrid blasphemer; that he was unworthy of forgiveness;

that he prayed the people, the Queen, and the Pope, to have pity on, and to pray for, his wretched soul; that in this, his recantation, he was without fear, or hope of favour, and was actuated only for the discharge of his conscience. It was, after a debate in council, decided that such a monster should not escape justice; that it could be no honour to the Church, to see reconciled to her a wretch covered with robberies, sacrileges, perjuries, treasons, and bloodshed. Finding now that he must die, and carrying in his breast all his malignity undiminished, he re-recanted the above recantation, and expired protesting against the very religion in which, *only nine hours before, he called God to witness, he firmly believed.* Thus died Cranmer, in his sixty-fifth year, twenty-nine years of which, were spent in a series of acts, which, for wickedness in their nature, and mischief in their consequences, are without any thing approaching to a parallel in the annals of human infamy. (See Authorities in Lingard; Cranmer's Life.)

Q. *What inference would you draw from all this?*

A. That England was not more fortunate, in her first Protestant apostle, than Germany or Geneva, and that Catholics ought sincerely to regret, that the noble and learned sons of the once pious and religious England, should have fallen victims to the delusion, that if God's Church required reformation, He would have chosen such an unhallowed miscreant for that purpose.

SECTION VII.

Q. *Cranmer and his associates in the English reformation were any thing, but men sent by God, to reform his Church; was Knox, the founder of Presbyterianism, a man of the same stamp?*

A. According to our latest and best Scottish Protestant historian, he was a dreadful compound of vice, as you shall shortly be convinced.

Q. *In what year was Knox born?*

A. In 1505. He studied in Glasgow, where he took priest's orders, before the canonical age. When he commenced reformer, he was forty years old. (Tytler, vol. vi. p. 2.)

Q. *What does Beza say of him?*

A. That he was condemned, as a heretic, and degraded from the priesthood. (Ibid, p. 3.) This accounts for his reforming propensities.

Q. *What was his first act with which we are acquainted?*

A. He cast his lot with the assassins of Cardinal Beaton; he openly declared his approval of their principles, and thus became a participator in murder. (Ibid, p. 3.)

Q. *What took place in the Castle of St Andrews in 1546?*

A. Knox, who had retreated into the Castle, and joined the murderers, declared with these murderers, that they would give up the Castle, the moment they received a Papal absolution from the murder of the Cardinal; and yet, while he was emitting this declaration, he and they were writing to Henry VIII., that he should try to delay the absolution, that they only wished to gain time, and that they had no notion of giving up the fortress. What hypocrisy, for an emissary from heaven! (Ibid, p. 8.)

Q. *By whom was Knox empowered to preach? Is there any proof that God sent him?*

A. He received his mission from John Rough, a dismissed chaplain, and without any other order, began to give the word, with as much confidence, as if he had been sent by God. (Ibid, pp. 9, 10.)

Q. *What happened on the Festival of St Giles to a religious procession headed by the Bishops and the Regent?*

A. It was assaulted by Knox's party, who had resolved on revenge. Royalty was insulted, religion was outraged in the persons of her chief pastors, and according to Knox, down went the very cross itself. (Ibid, 77.)

Q. *Had Knox the merit of being even a courageous apostle of error?*

A. Oh no; he was very unlike St Peter or St Paul; he was reported to the Queen as a seducer; he fled; and Tytler says, "he betrayed some want of the ardent courage of the martyr." (Ibid, 80, 81.)

Q. *When Knox fled to Geneva, what was the conduct of his fanatical followers?*

A. They described the Bishops of the Church as members of Satan, declared they would strive against them unto death, denounced vengeance against the superstition of Rome; even toleration, says Tytler, was at an end. (Ibid, p. 84.)

Q. *What happened when Knox had the courage to return?*

A. He delivered a fanatical tirade against idolatry; his enraged followers demolished the altar of St Giles, broke in upon the shrine, and shivered its ornaments to pieces. They then rushed to the houses of the black and grey friars, and these magnificent edifices were at once spoiled of their wealth, their altars, and every ancient and hallowed relic, were torn down and defaced. (Ibid, pp. 99, 100.)

Q. *What did Knox's congregation say in its third Letter?* (Keith, p. 87.)

A. It was addressed to *The Pestilent Prelates* (Catholic Bishops); it arrogated to Knox and his murderous followers

the appellation of the CONGREGATION OF CHRIST; it called their opponents, the offspring of the man of sin; and "concluded," says Tytler, "in a manner which *none can read without sorrow*, uniting expressions of *extremest vengeance and wrath*, with the *holy name of God*. (Ibid, p. 104.)

Q. *What were the consequences of Knox's fanatical ravings?*

A. At Crail, Anstruther, and St Andrews, he spoke like a madman to the mob; he profaned the sacred name of Christ, to blind and excite his ignorant followers, who, *immediately after*, demolished altars, broke down crosses, and levelled the Dominican and Franciscan monasteries to the ground. (Ibid, pp. 108, 109.)

Q. *Was Knox a hypocrite?*

A. He used the service-book of Edward VI., whilst he condemned it in his heart (ibid, 119); and, at the very time when he intended to overturn all authority in church and state, he says in a letter to an English knight: "Persuade yourself, and assure others, that we mean neither sedition nor rebellion against any just and lawful authority." (Ibid, p. 119.)

Q. *Had Knox really approved of the murder and murderers of Cardinal Beaton?*

A. Tytler, remarking on a letter of his, says, his words go far to intimate his approval of their conduct. Knox, in this letter, speaking of Henry, calls him the GOOD father of Elisabeth. What shocking hypocrisy!—the wife-destroyer is called *good* by the founder of Presbyterianism! (Ibid, 138.)

Q. *What did his holy congregation do immediately after he wrote to England, declaring that neither sedition nor rebellion was his object?*

A. They bound themselves, not only to subvert the Catholic religion, but to *overturn the government* of the Regent. (Ibid, pp. 142, 143.) After the lapse of a short time, Knox and Willock advised the congregation actually to depose the Regent. (Ibid, p. 145.) The congregation proceeded to carry this advice into execution; they tell their sovereign's representative, that, for weighty reasons, 'her authority is suspended by them,—an act which even Tytler declares to be open rebellion. (Pp. 146, 147.)

Q. *What does this convicted hypocrite do next?*

A. He has the presumption to tell his rebel followers, that they must call on the *eternal God*, to aid them in their *rebellion* (Ibid, p. 150;) and then he advises the unprincipled Elisabeth, who was bound by league with France, not to aid the rebels of Scotland, *to evade this treaty, by sending, as if without her*

consent, a thousand men or more into Scotland; and then, to cover her treachery, by *declaring them rebels* after their arrival in the latter country. (Ibid., p. 152.)

Q. *When the Regent died in 1560, full, as Tytler says, of faith and hope, what was the conduct of the savage ministers of reform?*

A. Even on her death-bed, she was annoyed with their ranting, against the abomination of the Mass; and they refused to her remains, a decent Christian burial. (Tytler, p. 164; Calderwood MS. Brit. Mus. vol. i. p. 421.)

Q. *Why did Knox and his congregation depend on the aid of the nobles in subverting the religion of the country?*

A. "Because," says Tytler, "many of the nobles had already tasted the *sweets of ecclesiastical plunder*, and were likely disposed to give up what they had won." (Ibid., p. 174.)

Q. *Did Knox desire, like a disinterested apostle, to leave this Church plunder in the hands of the nobles?*

A. No; he first called upon the parliament (using the sacred name of Jesus) to persecute with vigour the Romish clergy, and deprive them of every thing. He next told them that this demand was not *his* but God's; and then concludes by demanding, for his congregational ministers, a share of the Church plunder, with which the nobles were unwilling to part. (Ibid., 180, 181.)

Q. *Was this persecution of the Catholic clergy carried into effect?*

A. It was ordained, that all who said Mass, or dared even to hear Mass, were, for the first offence, to be punished with the *confiscation of goods*; for the second, with *banishment from the kingdom*; and for the third, with *death*. Thus did the very hypocrites, who, only a little before, were brawling about liberty of conscience for themselves, openly compel others to swallow their absurd religious nostrums, under the penalty of death. (See Tytler, p. 185.)

Q. *What says Goodman, Knox's intimate friend, writing to Cecil, the English minister?*

A. He exhorts Cecil to put the bloody Bishops to death, as God had himself already pronounced sentence of death against them, and openly upbraids Cecil with leniency. (Ibid., p. 186.)

Q. *Did Knox show any disposition to share in the spoils of the Church?*

A. "There were none," says he, "within the realm more unmerciful to the *poor ministers* than those which had the greatest rents of the churches." (Knox, p. 276.) He calls

those who *robbed the churches, thieves, and wonders why they do not restore, not to the true owners, but to him and his gang of unsent ministers.* "If," says he, "the *ministry of the Church had their own*, the kitchens of the nobles would lack two parts of what they *unjustly possess.*" "Some," says he, "were licentious, some had greedily gripped the possessions of the Church, and others thought, that they would not lack their part of Christ's coat." (Knox, p. 276; Tytler, *ibid*, 188, 189.) So this founder of Presbyterianism considered the *riches of the Church*, as Christ's coat, and seemed to wish the whole coat to himself and his abettors. (See Tytler, pp. 250, 251.)

Q. *Did Knox counsel murder?*

A. When the holy sacrifice of the Mass was to be offered in the Queen's chapel, Knox inveighed so bitterly against it, that the furious Master of Lindsay, in armour, rushed to the door, declaring that the priests should *die the death.* This madman was prevented from executing his purpose by Lord James, who opposed him at the door of the chapel, for which Lord James was ironically and bitterly reprehended by Knox. (*Ibid*, pp. 237, 238.) At a subsequent period, the death of a Papal envoy was resolved on by the murderous family of Knox, and he was saved only by the peremptory remonstrance of the Earl of Mar. (*Ibid*, 263.) "Knox and his brethren," says Tytler, "*excited feelings of resentment, and his endeavours were seldom accompanied by sound discretion or Christian love.*" (*Ibid*, p. 269.)

Q. *What does Randolph, writing to Cecil, say of Knox and his holy family?*

A. He says, they pray that God will either turn the Queen's heart, or *give her a short life.* From what *charity or spirit* this proceedeth, I leave to be discussed by the great divines; all this, too, whilst, Lethington says, the Queen (Catholic) behaved with much forbearance. "Knox, in his language," says Tytler, "was coarse, Lethington scoffed at him, Morton ordered him to hold his peace, and Randolph regretted that he had more zeal than *charity.*" (*Ibid*, p. 270.)

Q. *Was the character of Knox that of treachery?*

A. Tytler says: "To excite suspicions, and interrupt the good understanding between the two Queens (Mary and Elisabeth), became a favourite object with Knox." (*Ibid*, p. 278.)

Q. *Did Knox and his party take the persecution of the Catholics into their own hands?*

A. When the Catholics fled to the woods and mountains,

where they worshipped in silent solitude, the Presbyterians under Knox took the law into their own hands, seized the priests, and declared that, without having recourse to Queen or council, they would with their own hands execute upon idolaters the punishment contained in God's word. (Tytler, p. 281.) On the 19th of May thereafter, the Archbishop of St Andrews, the Prior of Whithern, the Parson of Sankuhar, and others, were tried and condemned for celebrating Mass. (Ibid, 280.) The insolence of Knox, to the Queen and council, excited the indignation of both Catholics and Protestants. (Ibid, 283.)

Q. Did Knox and his party, who must have been cognizant of each others movements, plot the death of Darnley?

A. The Presbyterians, led by Moray and Argyle, attempted to overawe their sovereign; they asked aid from the English Queen; it became a mere matter of debate, whether it would be best to assassinate Darnley or to deliver him to England. (Tytler, vol. vi. p. 343.) Randolph, writing to Cecil, says: "They" (the Presbyterians) "conclude that they find nothing, but that God must send him a *short end*." (P. 343.) Randolph seems to regret that so many should risk life, land, and goods, and concludes,—"*only to remedy so much mischief, he (Darnley) must be taken away.*" (Ibid, p. 344.)

Q. As regards the murder of Darnley, what said Maitland, in the presence of Moray and the principal nobility and council, all, or nearly so, of Knox's congregation?

A. That they could find a way to get her Majesty quit of Darnley, and that Lord Moray, though a Protestant, would look through his fingers, and see them do this (murder Darnley), and say nothing thereto. It is certain, says Tytler, that Mary commanded these murderers to abandon any such design, and to leave every thing to God; yet the bond or agreement for the murder of Darnley was entered into by these wretched reforming miscreants. (See Tytler, vol. vii. p. 52, 53.)

Q. Were Knox and Craig, the two founders of Presbyterianism, directly connected with the murder of Rizzio, Queen Mary's secretary?

A. Tytler, vol. vii. pp. 20, 21, 22, establishes this fact beyond a doubt: "Knox and Craig," he says, "were made acquainted with the conspiracy; and with these were associated all the leading reformers, with Darnley at their head. These bloody men, who were all religion without, and real demons within, held a general fast, at the very time they intended to steep their hands in a brother's blood."

Q. What sort of sermons were given, during this week of

humiliation, by Knox and the ministers, when just about to commit murder?

A. The subjects chosen were such as seemed calculated to prepare the public mind for resistance, violence, and bloodshed,—subjects, such as the slaying of Oreb and Zeeb, the cutting off the Benjamites, the hanging of Haman, &c. (Ibid, p. 28; Knox, pp. 340, 341.)

Q. *Can you give any other proof that Knox, the apostle of Presbyterianism, was clearly implicated in this murder?*

A. He fled in the most cowardly manner, immediately after the murder, to the fastnesses of Kyle, where he remained concealed for a year. (Ibid, pp. 35, 36, 40, 41, and 119.)

Q. *Who were the parties chiefly engaged in this dastardly murder?*

A. Tytler says: “Morton succeeded in securing the co-operation of the reformed Church; he next drew in Moray; and he then obtained the support of Elisabeth and her chief ministers, Cecil and Leicester.” (Ibid, p. 20.)

Q. *What did Knox do, when he found the King murdered, and the Queen in prison?*

A. He had the courage to return, to join with the murderers of Rizzio and Darnley in denouncing vengeance against the murderers of the King,—a murder they evidently had committed themselves, and of which, there can be little doubt that Knox was at least cognizant; and they concluded by resolving to put down, by force of arms, the Catholic religion. (Ibid, p. 120.)

Q. *What was done by the reformers, Lindsay, Ruthven, and Knox, at the coronation of Queen Mary's infant son at Stirling?*

A. The two former swore, *what they knew to be false*, that Mary's demission of the crown was her own free act; and after witnessing this gross act of perjury, Knox preached the sermon. (Ibid, 139.)

Q. *What does Tytler remark on Lethington's speech, where he congratulates the reformers, that they had secured their religion without iron or bloodshed?*

A. He says, he scarcely knows which most to condemn,—the inaccuracy of Lethington's picture, or the hardness evinced by its coming from *his* lips; since the rising of Moray against the Queen's marriage, the murder of Rizzio, the assassination of Darnley, the imprisonment of the Queen (he might have added the murder of Cardinal Beaton, and the butchery of the sainted Mary in England), were all, more or less, connected with the establishment of the reformation in Scotland. (Ibid, pp. 163, 164.)

Q. Were Knox or his followers remarkable in the results of their teachings?

A. Their confession of faith doomed all who heard Mass to death. They made all who held any public office swear to extirpate Popery; they warred with their own laity for the spoils of the Church (*ibid*, pp. 163-4-5); they employed the very men who *did* murder Darnley, to accuse their own virtuous Queen of that awful crime. (*Ibid*, p. 221.) Nay, Knox himself advises Cecil to *strike at the root*, that is, to murder Mary (*ibid*, p. 247); and in this fiendish advice, he dares to profane God's sacred name. "Strike at the root," says he; "turn your een unto your God; God grant you wisdom; yours to command in God"—John Knox with one foot in the grave. Gracious God! Whilst this minister, the head of the Presbyterian Church, counsels the murder of his own sovereign, he has the hypocrisy to pray that God *may grant wisdom to the murderer!!!*

Q. What sort of character was Moray, the leader, as Tytler styles him, of the reformed party. (Ibid, p. 254.)

A. Whilst this Protestant author speaks of him as a man having *deep feelings of religion*, he himself, almost in the next sentence, points him out as a man, not only without religion, but totally destitute of honour, principle, and even of humanity. He consented, says Tytler, to the *murder of Rizzio*; he *leagued himself with the murderers of the King*; he *used the evidence of these murderers to convict his sovereign*; he *betrayed Norfolk, treacherously delivered up Northumberland*; he *made the most ignominious offers to Elisabeth*; and how difficult is it, says our author, to think that religious truth could have a place in *his* heart, whose last transaction was to *aggravate the imprisonment, if not to recommend the death, of his own sister and his sovereign.* (*Ibid*, p. 254-5.)

Q. How did the hoary hypocrite, Knox, behave on the murder of Moray?

A. He had the body of the above monster placed before the pulpit, and preached his funeral oration from these words: "*Blessed are the dead WHO DIE IN THE LORD.*" (*Tytler*, vol. vii. pp. 254, 255.)

Q. What is the next move of this holy reformer?

A. He openly calls for the death of his lawful Queen, pronounces the threatenings of the law against all who maintain that *wicked woman*, and declares that the plague shall never cease in the land, as long as *she and her supporters* remain unpunished, according to the sentence of *God's law*, (*Ibid*, p. 287.) If page 295, you will find this cowardly

hypocrite flying again for fear of the Hamiltons. In page 332, we find this apostle closing his career, as he had lived, a very model of hypocrisy. The persecutor—the sacrilegious participator in murder—the regicide in desire—the plunderer of God's temple—the instigator to the murder of God's people—the man who cared not what means he used, so he attained his end—now closes his criminal course, and falls into the hands of the living God with a lie upon his lips. "God knows," he says, "that in my heart I never hated the persons of those against whom I thundered God's judgments; I did only hate their sins, and laboured to gain them to Christ." Yes, if to murder, were to gain them!!

Q. Is it at all likely, that God could select such a character, for the reformation of his Church?

A. When we consider the men whom God, in every age, chose as the ministers of his mercies to man—Moses, Aaron, the Prophets, the Apostles; when we reflect, that whatever these men were, before their appointment to a Divine Mission, they were, from the moment of such appointment, mild, holy, merciful, full of zeal, but zeal tempered with the most refined and exalted charity,—we must come to the conclusion, that the man who would consider Knox, or any one of the great reforming leaders, as an instrument, in the hand of God, either for the establishment or the reformation of religion, must have lost his reason.

Q. If then neither the authors of Protestantism, nor their work itself, nor the means they adopted to effect their purpose, are from God, what are their followers obliged to?

A. They are obliged, under pain of eternal perdition, to seek earnestly and re-enter the true Church, which, seduced by Luther and his associates, they abandoned: If they be sincere, God will aid them in their inquiry.

Q. What is the situation of the man who does not at once acquit himself of this obligation?

A. He is the victim of heresy and schism; the thing he calls a church, has no pastors lawfully sent or ordained; hence, he can receive none of the Sacraments, declared in Scripture to be so necessary to salvation.

Q. What think you of those (they are many) who are at heart convinced that the Catholic Church is the only true one, and are still such cowards as to dread making a public profession of their faith?

A. "He," says our Saviour (Luke ix. chap. 26 ver.) "who shall be ashamed of me and of my words, of him the Son of man shall be ashamed, when he shall come in his majesty."

Q. What think you of those who are inclined to Catholicism, but out of family considerations, or for fear of the world, neglect to embrace it?

A. Our Saviour (St Matth. x.) tells such, that he who loves father or mother more than God, is unworthy of God.

Q. What say you to those who become Protestants, or remain Protestants, from motives of worldly gain or honour?

A. I say with our Saviour, (St Mark viii.) What will it avail a man, if he gain the whole world, and suffer the loss of his soul?

CHAPTER IV.

ON FAITH.

SECTION I.

Q. What is faith?

A. It is a divine light or grace which God sheds upon our souls, by which we believe firmly in God, and in all that he has revealed, even what we do not by reason comprehend.

Q. Why do you believe things you do not understand?

A. Because most of the truths of revelation are above our comprehension,—such as the unity and Trinity of God, the incarnation of our Saviour, the creation, &c. They are not, however, less true, because we cannot tell *how* such things can be. God, who is *infinitely good*, and cannot deceive us; God, who is *infinitely wise*, and cannot be deceived himself, has revealed them; and Christ says to St Thomas, “Blessed are they who have not seen, and have believed.” (John xv. 29.)

Q. Could not man, of himself, have known the truths of revelation?

A. “Hardly,” says the Scripture, “do we guess aright at things that are upon earth;.....but the things that are in heaven who shall search?”

Q. Are we bound to believe all that God has revealed?

A. Most certainly; otherwise, we insult God by questioning his infallible word. “He that believeth not, maketh God a liar.” (1 John v. 10.)

Q. Must we believe in Jesus Christ, as well as, in his doctrine?

A. Yes; because “this is his command, that we believe in the name of his Son Jesus Christ.” (1 John iii. 23.) “He that believeth not in the Son shall not see life.” (John iii. 26.) With regard to his doctrine, it is said in the last chapters

of Matthew and Mark : "He that believes, and is baptized, shall be saved ; and he that believes not, shall be condemned." See also Matth. x. Mark viii. Luke ix. and 2 John ix. In fine, St Paul says, "without faith it is impossible to please God" (Heb. xi. 6) ; and the fate of unbelievers is declared the same as that of murderers. (Rev. xxi. 8.)

Q. What is the object of this divine faith ?

A. Each and every revealed truth, whether that truth be contained in the Holy Scripture, or in divine tradition, of which, we shall speak in a subsequent chapter.

Q. When the reformers found, that there was no unity amongst them,—that no two sects,—scarcely two individuals, believed the same revealed truths, what subterfuge had they recourse to ?

A. They declared, that it was not necessary to believe every revealed truth ; that it was quite sufficient, to admit a few articles, commonly believed by all sects ; and that the rest of revelation, upon which these sects differed, was not at all necessary to salvation. The former they called *fundamentals* ; the latter *non-fundamentals*.

Q. What say you, to this ingenious device for securing a semblance of unity ?

A. We say, the *whole* of revelation is *God's word* ; to reject any part of it, is to give him the lie : it was revealed to be believed. "Our Saviour tells his Apostles, to teach, not two or three fundamentals, but *all* things whatsoever he had commanded.

Q. Should not those, who make this distinction, tell us clearly what are, and what are not, fundamentals, since true faith is so necessary to salvation ?

A. Yes ; but here they are silent ; their principle is impossible in practice. Mosheim, Buddeus, and Zimmerman confess, that it is easy to talk of fundamentals, but when it becomes question of deciding what and how many these fundamental articles are, all must acknowledge their ignorance. This distinction is then a pure absurdity, because it is impracticable.

Q. Admitting that there are fundamental and non-fundamental articles of faith, is there not still a difficulty for Protestants ?

A. Yes ; for St Paul says, that without faith we cannot please God. Now, if Protestants cannot know, what are fundamentals, they cannot have true faith, because, they can never be certain, that they believe exactly all the fundamentals, and without this certainty they cannot have true faith.

Q. Is not this doctrine, as to fundamentals, absurd ?

A. Yes; because, whilst there can be only one true faith, the supporters of this doctrine must throw open the gates of heaven to all sectarians, no matter how contradictory their doctrines; for, as they cannot distinguish the fundamental from the non-fundamental doctrines, it is clear, they cannot tell who believe them, and who reject them; hence, they must embrace the deist who denies the Scripture, and the Unitarian who rejects even the Divinity of Christ.

Q. *Are not these Protestants guilty of another contradiction?*

A. They admit, that the Catholics have always held all the fundamentals; and, if so, why did they separate from the Catholic Church, and steep Europe in blood, by that separation, since, even according to themselves, to believe the fundamentals, is all that is necessary for salvation?

Q. *May they not say, reason will point out these fundamentals to each particular person?*

A. No; for as each man's reason is different from that of his neighbour, so will men differ in their fundamentals; and, consequently, there can be no unity of faith. Besides, reason is a fallible guide, and hence, it may lead into error, as to the fundamentals so essentially necessary to salvation.

Q. *Is it not vain to appeal here, as some have done, to sentiment or feeling as enabling us to discover the fundamentals?*

A. These are still more whimsical, than reason. They produce, instead of one faith, a mass of contradictions. The deist *feels* God, but *feels* no revelation; the Arminian *feels* not the necessity of grace; Luther *feels*, whilst Calvin does not *feel*, the *real presence*; the Unitarian does not *feel* the Trinity; the Established Church of Scotland, *feels* the benefit of state funds and state control, whilst the Free Kirk *feels* that the funds of the state are excellent, but its control pernicious.

Q. *Do not some say, that the Spirit will point out for them the fundamentals?*

A. This is the argument of every madman; according to this fancy, it was the *Spirit* of God who taught one faith to Luther, and another to Calvin; one to Wesley, and another to Knox.

Q. *What do you conclude from all this?*

A. That this distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals, is the miserable subterfuge of a bad cause, and that the Catholic system, which teaches us to believe, without exception or distinction, *every truth* contained in revelation, is not only rational, but absolutely necessary to preserve unity of faith.

SECTION II.

Q. Can Protestants have divine faith?

A. No; because divine faith is incompatible with doubt, and the faith of a Protestant must ever be accompanied by doubt.

Q. What two particular qualities, must faith have, that it may be divine?

A. It must be *firm and undoubting*; and it must be *PRUDENTLY firm and undoubting*.

Q. Why firm and undoubting?

A. Because, otherwise, it will not be divine faith, but mere *human* opinion. Divine faith is incompatible with doubt; rather than call the smallest particle into doubt, we must be ready to lay down our lives; because God, the author of faith, cannot deceive.

Q. Why do you say that faith must be prudently firm?

A. Because, no matter how strong and firm the inward conviction be, if it be irrational—that is, grounded on false reasoning—it is not a virtue, but rather the effect of a vicious, because wilful obstinacy: such is the faith of the Turk and the heretic of every sect.

Q. Where do you find the above-mentioned conditions of divine faith?

A. Only amongst Catholics; because, they only, follow a rule of faith, which places the truth of their belief beyond the possibility of doubt.

Q. What is that which you here call a rule of faith?

A. That which guides us to the belief and practice of all that God has revealed and commanded.

Q. What is the Catholic rule of faith?

A. The *whole* Word of God, understood infallibly in its true sense.

Q. Is not the written Word of God alone a sufficient rule of faith?

A. No; because it is susceptible of different senses, and the interpreter may give it a wrong sense. Hence, that it may be to us, an infallible rule of true faith, we must be absolutely certain that we understand the disputed passages correctly.

Q. Have Catholics on this head any certainty?

A. Their certainty is entire, because they receive from the Church, which they prove to be infallible, the exposition of the Scripture.

Q. Have not Protestants this same certainty?

A. No; for each Protestant explains the Scripture according to his own particular light, or fancy, or prejudice.

Hence, he can never be certain that he is right, as he can never be absolutely certain that he is not deceived in his interpretation. This we shall see at length when we speak of the rule of faith.

SECTION III.

Q. Show us, why those, who are not Catholics, can have no other than a doubting or vacillating faith?

A. It is, because, there are three essential points upon which they have no real certainty. They have no real certainty, as to the *canon of Scripture*; they have none, as regards their *versions or translations of Scripture*; and they can never be certain, that their *interpretations are the genuine meaning of God's Word?*

Q. Why cannot Protestants know, with infallible certainty, what books of Scripture are canonical and divine?

A. Because they profess to believe nothing, but what is expressly laid down in Scripture. Now, the Scripture neither does, nor can, tell us what books are canonical,—that is, what and how many books are God's divine Word; this is admitted even by the most learned Protestants. To be a certain rule of faith, the Scripture should inform us, with the utmost certainty, what are the *true and uncorrupted copies* of the true and original Scripture. The last of the Scriptures were written nearly two thousand years ago; we know, that the last chapter, was added to Deuteronomy after the death of Moses, and that other changes have taken place since that time. What text, then, tells us that these changes were made by *inspired men*, and not by *impostors*? Without certainty on this head, the Bible cannot be a secure rule of faith.

Q. Can Protestants be certain, that the Jewish Rabbins did not corrupt the original Scripture?

A. No; this is another question the Bible cannot answer. If these ignorant and malicious men, who hated Christianity, and in that hatred, had a sufficient motive for corrupting Christianity in its source, when they inserted, after the time of Christ, points to indicate, where there should be vowels, inserted maliciously a wrong point; may they not thus have perverted verses and chapters, nay, whole books of Scripture? and what Protestant can be *now* certain that they did not do so?

Q. Cannot they know the books that are divine, by their excelling beauty and thrilling expression, as you know honey or sugar by their sweetness?

A. No; for if that could be, then all Protestants would have acknowledged the same books as canonical, and yet, they have not agreed upon this point. The first Protestants

rejected the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse, or Revelations, whilst the Protestants of the present day, receive these books as divine. Calvin called the Epistle of St James an Epistle of gold, whilst Luther styled the *same* an Epistle of straw.

Q. May they not say, that they know the canonical books by their titles?

A. If we must receive the Gospel of St Matthew, because it bears his name, we should, for the same reason, receive the Gospels of St Thomas and St Bartholomew, because they bear the names of these Apostles, and yet all Christians reject these two Gospels as apocryphal.

Q. May they not say, that they receive the true books of Scripture on the authority of tradition?

A. No; they reject tradition, on every other question, as a doubtful source of truth; hence, every doctrine drawn from it must be, for them, uncertain. Divine faith, they say, cannot rest on tradition as a foundation; if, therefore, they know what books are divine only from tradition, it evidently follows that they do not, and cannot, believe these books to be God's Word with divine faith.

Q. What happened at Strasbourg in the year 1598?

A. The Protestants expunged from their canon of Scripture, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of St James, and the Apocalypse; and, seventy-four years after, they again replaced them. This fact may be seen in their old Ritual, in the chapter ON DOCTRINE, and in the new Ritual, page 7.

Q. What do you conclude from this?

A. That they were all certainly wrong, either in expunging or receiving these books; that if they were evidently wrong, in a matter of such awful importance, as is the integrity of the Scripture, they can have no certainty that they are right in any thing; that, in fine, their faith resting thus, not upon any rational or certain foundation, but on the mere whims of men, cannot be prudently firm, and, by a necessary consequence, cannot be divine faith.

SECTION IV.

Q. Why have you said, that those who are not Catholics, can never be certain, that their translations from the original Scriptures are correct or faithful?

A. Because few, if any of them, understand the original languages; so that they are incapable of judging whether their translations are conformable to the originals.

Q. May they not reply, that they have every necessary

security from their translators, whose knowledge of Greek and Hebrew was indisputable ?

A. No ; for these translators have given very different and contradictory versions. Translation from dead languages is at all times difficult ; the original idiom of the Bible has not been in use for upwards of two thousand years ; the translators are mere men, and, of course, fallible. Zwinglius says, Luther was a foul corrupter of God's Word ; Luther retorts the compliment upon Zwinglius ; Beza condemns the translation of Æcolampadius, and Castalio condemns that of Beza ; the Protestant Bishop Tunstal counted two thousand errors in the first English translation ; and Dr Broughton says, the English Bible is so corrupt, as to send thousands into eternal flames. The very translators themselves confess, "that they are not certain that they have given the true Word of God in every passage, but merely what *THEY supposed to be the best readings.*" Such is the Protestant rule,—such the thing to which they trust their immortal souls ! Here they can have no certainty.

Q. What does Luther himself avow as regards translations of Scripture ?

A. That he had added the word "ONLY" to the text of St Paul (Rom. chap. iii.): for "we account a man to be justified by faith," he has, "by faith *ONLY.*"

Q. How did he justify himself, when reproached with this ? (Tom. iii. Edit. de Jena, pp. 141, 144.)

A. "I know well," he says, "that the word *only* is not to be found in the text of St Paul ; but if any Papist plague you on the subject, tell him at once, that it was the will of Dr Martin Luther that it should be added ; and please to say further, that a Papist and an ass are one and the same thing." "*I am sorry,*" says he, in addition, "that I have not *added other words.* This word '*ONLY*' will remain in *my* New Testament, until all the Papists burst themselves with spite."

Q. What do you conclude from this ?

A. That no prudent man can have any confidence in a Protestant Bible, since he can never be certain that it is properly translated. The English versions are of the same stamp with the German. (See D'Israeli's *Curiosities of Literature*, Edit. 1843, vol. iii. p. 530, et seq.)

Q. Can you draw any further inference ?

A. Yes ; that the faith of Protestants, grounded, as it is, on *doubtful* versions of Scripture, is not prudently firm, and, consequently, is not divine.

Q. But have the Catholics themselves an absolute certainty

as to the number of the sacred books, and the truth of the translations from them?

A. Yes; the Catholics are perfectly certain as regards both points. The Church points out the books that are canonical, and the correct versions of these books. Now, a fundamental principle of the Catholic religion is, that the Church is infallible; because Christ says, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against her; that He will be with her all days; that His Holy Spirit will teach her all truth for ever." Hence, the Catholic grounds his faith on what is *certainly* God's Word, and his faith, consequently, is certainly divine.

SECTION V.

Q. *Why have you said, that Protestants have no certainty or security, as regards the true sense of the Scripture?*

A. The passages of Scripture, which regard controverted points, may be tortured into two different, and sometimes opposite meanings; now, the Scripture itself does not, and cannot, tell us, which is the true sense. The Scripture cannot explain itself: nay, St Peter (2 Pet. iii. 16) tells us, that parts of Scripture "*are hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do all the other SCRIPTURES, to their own destruction.*" Nay, the Scripture cannot even prove, that itself is the Word of God, and this Protestants admit. (Chillingworth, p. 69, No. 49; and Hooker Eccl. Polém. lib. i. S. 14, p. 86.) Dr Covel (Defence, Art. iv. p. 31) declares, "It is not the Word of God, which *does, or can assure us, that we do well to think it the Word of God.*" The Bible then, cannot tell us these two most important of all truths: that *itself* is the true Word of God, and *what is* its true and genuine sense.

Q. *Have not Protestants said, that they are individually inspired to understand, in its true sense, any passage of Scripture?*

A. Yes; but they have said many very absurd things. According to this blasphemous assertion, it was the Spirit of God who taught Luther the *real* presence, whilst the same Spirit taught Calvin the *figurative* presence; it is God who inspires the Church of England to have bishops, and the Church of Scotland to reject them; one sect of Protestants, to admit good works as necessary to salvation, and another, to reject them; one minister, to account baptism necessary to salvation, and another, to repute it as a mere ceremony. Surely, if they were inspired, they would all believe the same doctrines.

Q. May they not say, that the ambiguous texts are easily explained by those that are clear?

A. Yes; they may say any thing; but it so happens, that each flatters himself, that the texts which appear to support his peculiar notions are abundantly clear. Thus, to prove that *Christ is not God*, the Unitarians think those words: "*My Father is greater than I;*" and these others: "*That Christ is the first born of creatures,*" very clear indeed. The Presbyterians, to prove that the Sacrament is only bread and wine, think these words: "*the flesh profiteth nothing, the words which I speak to you are spirit and life,*" the clearest portion of Scripture; as if, any Christian in his senses could believe, that the flesh of Christ, by which, in union with the Divinity, the world was redeemed, profited nothing. The Anabaptists, to prove, that infants should not be baptized, bring forward, what they imagine is very clear, these words: "*TEACH all nations, baptizing them;*" and, "*he who BELIEVETH and is baptized shall be saved.*"

Q. Do other Christians think these clear also?

A. Yes; some think them very clear in proving the opposite doctrines, and others think them the most obscure passages in the Inspired Volume.

Q. Do these sects quote other texts, to prove their peculiar notions?

A. Yes; they will quote texts by the dozen, to prove any doctrine you please. It is quite clear, to the Free Kirk, from Scripture, that the Established Kirk is Antichrist; and to the latter, the Scripture as clearly proves the Free Church to be schismatical. To some, Joanna Southcote was the mother of the Messiah; to the followers of Wesley, the greatest crimes are only spots upon God's children; whilst to the Muckers, immorality is virtue.

Q. What inference would you draw from all this?

A. That a wise God, must have left in his Church some judge perfectly qualified to decide, authoritatively, on all religious disputes, and to point out, with certainty, the true sense of the Inspired Volume.

Q. Enforce this truth by a comparison.

A. As a legal process could never be terminated, if the counsel were allowed, to appeal merely to the book containing the law, so, religious disputes can never be settled, by an appeal merely to the Scriptures; and as a lawfully commissioned judge, is necessary for the settlement of civil matters, so is, a divinely appointed judge, necessary for the decision, of the more difficult and more important matters of religion.

Q. Who is that judge ?

A. The *teaching* body of the Church of Christ, whom he sent, to preach his Gospel to all nations, and to whom, he promised the continued guidance of his Spirit, even to the end of time.

Q. What do you understand here by the teaching body of the Church ?

A. I understand, not the Pope alone, nor the bishops alone, either severally or collectively, but the Pope, with the bishops *as a body*; and not every or any body, calling themselves bishops, but those only, who are in communion with the See of Rome.

CHAPTER V.

THE THREE PROTESTANT RULES OF FAITH.

SECTION I.

Q. What say you to the rule of faith adopted by the Socinian? He admits that the Scripture is inspired, but holds that reason is to be the interpreter of that divine revelation, and that nothing is to be admitted, but what reason can clearly comprehend.

A. We reply, in the first place, God is infinite; we are finite: hence, he can reveal many things of which we understand nothing, except the facts revealed; such are, for example, the Unity and Trinity of God, the creation, the Incarnation, &c. Now, can reason be our guide in things which it cannot comprehend? Will presumptuous, *finite* reason pretend to fathom the unfathomable abyss of God's *infinite* wisdom and power? Will it blasphemously tell God, that it will believe nothing but what it can understand,—that it will believe nothing on God's Word, unless he condescend to explain its nature?

Q. Is not reason fallible ?

A. Yes; and hence it cannot be the foundation of *faith*, which excludes all doubt; it can only be the foundation of *opinion*. Only open the pages which contain the sad history of man; look at the molten idols of ancient Rome and the garden gods of ancient Egypt,—at the contradictions and absurdities of Pagan and Christian schools, guided entirely by human reason; and you will be satisfied, that there is nothing ridiculous, gross, absurd, or shameful, which erring reason has not taught; and if so, surely it cannot be a *secure* rule of faith.

Q. Is the Socinian a safe rule?

A. No; all the sects in the world, professing Christianity, agree in denouncing the Socinian or Unitarian rule, and the creed founded on that rule. Most certainly, therefore, it is safer to follow the overwhelming majority of Christians, than to risk our salvation upon a rule lately adopted by a handful of men, who have no claim to the title of Christians, since they deny one of the fundamental articles of Christianity—the Divinity of Christ.

Q. Have you any other argument against this rule?

A. Yes, many. The reasons, or judgments of men, are as different as their faces; hence, an infinite variety of religions would be formed under the direction of reason. Look at our contradictory systems of medicine, philosophy, politics, and agriculture, and say: If such is the case in secular sciences, should we not have the same Babylonish confusion as regards religion, if reason were admitted as supreme judge? Should we not, in that case, have as many creeds as there are men,—as many varieties in religion, as there are different grades of strong or weak; polished or unpolished reason amongst men; in fine, the very rule of the Socinian is a contradiction to his reason.

Q. Is not the Christian rule much more rational?

A. Yes; God reveals certain truths, many of which are mysteries. The Socinian says: What I *understand* of these, I will believe; what my reason does not *comprehend*, I will reject: and thus an insolent *creature*, who is the mere work of God's hand, who does not understand even himself, who cannot comprehend half the mysteries which exist in and around him every moment, dares to disbelieve God's Word, unless God condescend to explain all to him. How *irrational* is such conduct! The Christian, on the contrary, when a mystery is proposed, seeks sufficient proof of the fact of revelation: satisfied on this head, he believes at once. God is infinitely *good*, he says, therefore he cannot deceive me; he is infinitely *wise*, therefore he cannot be deceived himself; whatever he reveals must be true; therefore I believe it, whether I understand it or not. We may then sound as we please the depths of worldly science; in this we are confined to no bounds; but in religion we have prescribed limits. It is a *positive* institution—"Thus far shalt thou go, and no further."

SECTION II.

Q. What say you to the rule adopted by the Anabaptists,

Quakers, Moravians, and Methodists, which consists in a supposed private inspiration made by God to each individual?

A. The conduct of those who adopted this delusion is its best refutation. Montanus and Maximilla were the first who adopted it, and they both *hanged themselves*. (Euseb. Ecel. Hist., Lib. v.) The followers of Carlostad were *privately inspired by God*, "to despoil and kill all the wicked." (Sleidan, De Statu Rel et Reip. Comment., Lib. iii. p. 45.) John Bockhold, following his *inspiration*, declared himself king of Sion; he married eleven wives; and, by order of *his spirit*, put them all to death. (Hist. de la Reform. par Ger. Brandt.) Herman was *inspired* to declare himself the Messiah,—to order that all priests and magistrates should be killed. (Brandt, p. 51.) David George declared himself the true son of God. (Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 484.) Such were the foreign Protestants who followed private inspiration as a rule of faith.

Q. *Were the English followers of this rule more moderate than their continental brethren?*

A. No; Nicholas taught, that faith and worship were useless; that men should continue in sin, that grace might abound. (Brandt, p. 51.) For the doings of Hackett and Venner's private inspiration, see Fuller's Hist. of the Church, p. 9, and Echard's Hist. of Eng. Fox, according to Penn's Journal, declared the Scripture only a secondary rule, subject to the Spirit; and one of his party entered the Parliament House with a drawn sword, saying he was authorized by the Holy Spirit to kill every man that sat in that House. (Mac-laine's Note on Mosheim, vol. v. p. 470.) James Naylor was *inspired* to have himself hailed as the "Prince of peace, the rose of Sharon, and the fairest of ten thousand." (Echard.) Wesley says of the Moravians, that many of them did not read the Scriptures, pray, or communicate, because that was seeking salvation by works. "Some of our English brethren say," he adds, "you will never have faith, till you leave off the Church and the Sacraments: as many go to hell by praying as by thieving." (Journal, 1740.) Such were the impious and blasphemous fruits of the rule called "private inspiration."

Q. *These unquestionable facts are shocking evidences against that rule; have you any additional argument to offer?*

A. The true rule of faith is a rule for all, whilst, with the exception of these few deluded Protestant fanatics, no body of Christians ever felt, or even pretended to feel, that they were privately inspired by God; therefore, the great mass

of Christians have ever been, and now are, without any rule of faith; and is this at all reconcilable with God's goodness and mercy?

Q. Did those who adopted this rule, directly contradict the Scripture?

A. Yes; their *spirit* told them to murder; the Scripture, says, "Thou shalt not kill." The spirit told them to sin, that grace might abound; the Scripture forbids all sin. Nay, they contradicted one another. The same Spirit of God taught one thing to Wesley and another to Bockhold,—one to Joanna Southcote and another to Fox. Finally, the Spirit of God, say these fanatics, teaches us what we are to believe, and what we are to do; but can they prove that it, in reality, is the Spirit of God, and not the spirit of error? (from their works, it would appear that the latter is their guide.) No, they cannot; for, in order to do so, they should work some unquestionable miracle; but in this they have never succeeded. What wise man, therefore, would be weak enough to abandon the Scripture, constant tradition, and Church authority, and deliver his soul to the guidance of such self-seut, foolish, and wicked pretenders to inspiration? They are guided by a spirit, but it is evidently the spirit of fanaticism, darkness, and error.

SECTION III.

Q. What is the third false rule of faith?

A. That of the respectable portion of Protestants, who maintain, that the Bible, and the Bible *only*, and the Bible, not as it sounds, or as it is understood by the learned, but as it is understood by each private individual, whether ignorant or learned, is the rule of faith, given by a wise and good God to mankind.

Q. Have you many arguments against this pretended rule?

A. Yes, very many. The first of which is derived from a comparison of this Protestant, with the Catholic rule of faith.

Q. What is the Catholic rule of faith?

A. All truly inspired Scripture, and all truly *divine tradition* (see Chap. on Tradition), interpreted, not by the ignorant, nor even the learned laity, but by the *lawfully sent and ordained* pastors of God's true Church.

Q. In comparing these rules, why do you give a preference to the Catholic rule?

A. Even at this moment, there are in the world seven Catholics, for one Protestant; hence, we have seven to one in favour of our rule; we have, in addition to this, the whole world during fifteen hundred years before Luther; and all

this is confirmed by the fact, that whilst all Catholics, of every age and country, agree, as to the rule of faith and its interpretation, no two sects of Protestants are agreed upon every question of religion ; nor do they give their rule of faith one and the same interpretation,—each *individual* Protestant explains the Scripture for himself, whilst each Catholic has the Scripture explained by all that is at present—or ever was—wise, learned, great, or good, in God's Church. The Protestant has only the security of his own *one* judgment ; the Catholic has that of the *whole* Church.

Q. Is there any thing absurd in this trait of Protestantism ?

A. Can any thing be more absurd, than that an ignorant peasant, should pretend to interpret the Inspired Volume better than all the pastors of the Church ?

Q. Would it be less absurd, if only learned Protestants pretended to do so ?

A. Very little indeed ; since they can be only considered a handful, when compared with the learned body of the Catholic Church ; if, as the Scripture says, "*There be wisdom among many counsellors,*" truth will be, on the side of Catholicism : we have the learning of eighteen centuries ; Protestants have only that of three.

Q. What is your next argument ?

A. During three hundred years, the Bible, as privately interpreted, has been the rule of Protestants ; now, if it had been the rule intended by God, all Protestants would have been of one faith,—they would have given the same interpretation to every passage. But the reverse is the case. Luther taught the real presence out of the Bible ; Zwinglius, out of the same book, taught the contrary ; the Church of England teaches one doctrine, the Kirk of Scotland another, and the Free Kirk a third ; and yet all follow the Bible, and interpret for themselves. They have proved the Bible, as privately interpreted, to be the fruitful source of delusions, heresies, and schisms.

Q. Is it not clear, that there can be only one true faith, as there is only one Lord, one baptism, one revelation, which can have only one true sense ?

A. Yes, beyond all doubt ; and the Protestant rule destroys this unity of faith. Let each man interpret the Bible for himself, and you will have, as is evident, from our swarms of Protestant sects, as many religions as there are different heads and judgments.

Q. May not the ministers restrain these sects by forcing all to accept their interpretation ?

A. No; for this would be in contradiction to their own principles; it would be destroying the right of private interpretation.

Q. *Does not the Protestant rule, facilitate the teaching of all sorts of error, and this without the possibility of applying an antidote?*

A. Yes, clearly. For example, an ignorant Unitarian cobbler denies the Divinity of Christ, on these words—"The Father is greater than I." It will be of no use for a Protestant minister to quote against him that other passage—"I and the Father are one;" for the cobbler will reply, that their unity is a unity of affection, not of nature, and this he will say is evident from the former passage. The minister must leave him in his error; for the cobbler will tell him he has a right to interpret Scripture for himself, and that he is, as good a judge, as any minister.

Q. *If the Bible be the only rule of faith, should not Protestants be able to tell us, with certainty, of what and how many books the Bible is composed?*

A. Certainly; yet this they cannot do. They have never agreed amongst themselves on this head; they reject nine or ten books, which we admit. St Paul to the Hebrews, St James, the second of St Peter, the third of St John, St Jude, and the Apocalypse, have been all successively admitted and rejected by Protestants. Their opinions, so often changed, show they have no certainty, as to what books really constitute the Bible; and, consequently, the Bible can never be for them a certain rule of faith.

Q. *What say you as to the books of Scripture which are lost, alluded to in Num. xxi. 14; 1 Kings iv. 32; Chron. ix. 29; 1 Cor. i. 9; Matth. xxvii. 9; Matth. ii. 23?*

A. If the Bible be the only rule, it is either the whole Bible, including the books that are lost, or it is that portion of the Bible which we still have; if the former, then the rule is incomplete; if the latter, then let Protestants, give us one text, declaring what we have, to be sufficient as a rule, and clearly indicating, the non-necessity of what is lost.

Q. *Can you draw any argument against the reformed rule, from the circumstance, that Christ appointed a body of pastors to teach and preach in his Church?*

A. Yes; the reformed rule makes these pastors an unnecessary lumber; for either these pastors and their people agree in their interpretation of Scripture, or they differ; if they agree, then give the people Bibles—the pastors are useless—the people can teach themselves; if they differ,

then which is right—the pastor or the people? Where is the certainty? If the pastor compel the people to follow his interpretation, then, their rule is destroyed; if he cannot do this, then again he is useless; and if they give up their own opinion and follow his, then, they are trusting their salvation to one fallible inan, who gives them, not the *infallible Word of God*, but his *fallible interpretation*, of that infallible Word.

Q. If Christ intended the Bible, to be man's only guide, should we not suppose, that he would have written it, or ordered it to be written?

A. Certainly; and yet he never did so; he never commanded his Apostles to *write Bibles*, but to *PREACH the Gospel*.

Q. What may we ask Protestants in addition?

A. Why did not the Apostles, who knew well the true rule of faith, write millions of Bibles, and send them, to all the ends of the earth, with a command that all should read them? Why did they not establish schools, that all might be taught to read? Why did only a few, even of the Apostles, *write their doctrines*? Why did they allow nearly one hundred years, to pass before the last book of Scripture was written; and what rule did the Christians of that century follow, since the Scripture was *incomplete*? Was not the world converted by the *preaching* of the Apostles and other pastors, and not by Bibles? Why did not the Apostles, even translate the Scriptures into the vulgar tongues of the nations they converted? Why did not St Peter and St Paul, who lived at Rome, translate into the Roman tongue, even their own Epistles? Why did St Paul write to the Romans in Greek,—a language, understood only by the learned?

Q. Does it appear, from undoubted facts, that God could never have intended the Bible, to be our only rule of faith?

A. We have seen that this was impossible during the first century, for the Bible was not completed. During the first four hundred years, it was equally impossible; few copies, and these few, written with the pen, existed. Some books of Scripture were lying at one Church, and some at another; and during these four hundred years, they were translated into only one language; yet, during these four hundred years, whilst the Bible, as a rule of faith, was a physical impossibility, *the whole world was converted*. Nay, until the art of printing was discovered, the Bible could not be the rule of faith; and thus Protestants must maintain, that the whole world was without any rule of faith, during the first fourteen hundred years of Christianity. During that time few could read, and

even if they were able, they could not get a copy of the Scripture, which cost immense sums. Even at present, there is not one Bible in existence for every ten souls; and what rule are those to follow, who cannot read? Thus, even during the first century, the Bible was not the only rule of faith, and much less was it the rule, during the first four, nay, during the first fourteen hundred years.

Q. If the Bible, as privately interpreted, were our only tribunal of appeal, would not God have acted like an unwise legislator who would make every man his own judge in matters of law?

A. Yes; and is not this consideration alone sufficient to convince every reflecting person of the futility of the Protestant rule? What sort of law should we have, if every man were his own advocate, as well as judge? If a wise legislator considers the judge of the law as important to the welfare of the community as the law itself, what are we to think of Protestants, who would make God give us a divine code of laws, without supplying us, with divinely appointed interpreters and judges of these laws? Such a principle contains in itself endless divisions and schisms. Luther's religion, which was *one* in him, became, by the adoption of this principle, the seed of an infinity of creeds; so much so, that scarcely two Protestants have the same faith.

Q. What does Capito, Protestant minister of Strasburg, admit in this matter?

A. "Our people now tell us," says he, "I know enough of the Gospel—I can read it for myself—I have no need of you." (Inter. Epist. Calv.) Dudith says to Beza, "Our people are carried away with every wind of doctrine; if you know what their religion is to day, you cannot tell, what it will be to-morrow. In what single point, are those who war against the Pope, agreed amongst themselves?" "It is of great importance," says Calvin to Melancthon, "that the divisions which subsist among us, should not be known to future ages."

SECTION IV.

Q. Does it appear from Scripture, that the written word was ever, either under the Old or the New Law, considered as the only rule of faith?

A. Until the time of Moses, there was no written revelation; yet Seth, Abraham, Isaac, Melchizedek, and all God's people, were saved, by the belief of truths for which they could have no authority but tradition.

Q. What says Moses as to the Book of the Law which he

wrote, and which was the first written revelation the world was favoured with?

A. He orders the Levites to deposit it "in the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord;" adding, "after *seven years*, in the year of remission,...thou shalt read the words of this law, before all Israel in their hearing." (Deut. xxxi. 24.) Was this a giving of the written word to the people, as their only rule? The Levites are ordered to read it to the people, and this, only once in the seven years.

Q. *What do we find in Deut., chap. xvii. 8, 9?*

A. God commands his people, whenever they find among them a hard and doubtful matter in judgment, "to come to the priests of the Levitical race, and to *the judge* that shall be at that time (the High Priest), and thou shalt ask of them," says the Lord, "and they shall show thee the truth of the judgment; and thou shalt do whatsoever they shall say...and what they shall teach thee: and he that will be proud, and refuse to obey the commandment of the priest who ministereth at that time,...that man shall die." Moses had written out the law by this time; yet he, the inspired oracle of heaven, does not put that written word, into the hands of the people, that by it, they might decide their disputes; on the contrary, he orders them, under pain of death, to have recourse to the priests of the Church, and especially to the High Priest. See 2 Paralip. (2 Chron. xix.) and Malachias ii. 7, where it is said, "the lips of the priest shall keep knowledge, and the people *shall seek* the law at his mouth."

Q. *Is not the New Testament equally clear on this head?*

A. Certainly; for Christ never wrote any thing, and never commanded his Apostles to write. In Heb. i. 2, it is said, "in these days (God) hath spoken," *not written* "to us, by his Son." In Matth. xxviii. 18, Christ does not say to his Apostles, Go, *write Bibles* to all nations; but, "Go, *teach* all nations." In Luke x. 16, He does not say, he that readeth, or heareth the Scripture, heareth me; but, "he that *heareth* you, heareth me." In Matth. xviii. 17, He does not say, he that will not *read the Scripture*; but, "he that will not *HEAR the Church*, is to be considered as a heathen and publican."

Q. *Is it not said—2 Pet. iii. 16—that there are in Scripture "things hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest unto their own destruction?"*

A. Yes; and how then, can any one believe, that God should leave, as our ONLY rule of faith, a book which the unlearned and unstable, *who form the great mass of mankind*, so easily wrest to their own perdition?

Q. *What does St Peter say*—2 Pct. ii. 20?

A. "No prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation;" and yet, in the very face of this text, Protestants say every text of Scripture is to be privately interpreted.

Q. *What does St Paul tell the Thessalonians*—2 Thess. v. 13?

A. That they are to hold fast, not the Bible alone, but the *tradition* they had been taught, whether by word or epistle; and the same Apostle tells Timothy to commit, not what he had *read*, but what he had *heard*, to faithful men, who should be able to *teach* others also. (2 Tim. ii. 2.)

SECTION V.

Q. *Are there not many essential truths, the knowledge of which is necessary to salvation, which are not clearly laid down in Scripture?*

A. Yes, many; such as, who are the true pastors of God's Church—who the wolves in sheeps' clothing—which of all the sects is the Church of Christ,—what her authority,—should she have a head upon earth,—who is to preside in her councils,—how is a disputed question to be settled,—what should be precisely her public service? The Scripture does not tell us, what are the true, original books of Scripture, or how many of these books form the canon; whether all the books we have, and neither more nor less, are God's uncorrupted Word in every part; or, in fine, whether the translations of them which we have, and upon which our salvation depends, are correct in every part. The Scripture does not clearly teach us any one of all these *necessary* truths; therefore, it cannot be of itself our only rule of faith.

Q. *What do you draw from the fact, that the Jews were, for generations, without the Bible as a rule of faith in their own tongue?*

A. A most important inference,—viz., that the *people of God* were all that time, without that, which Protestants maintain to be the only rule of faith. That people, lost the use of the *Hebrew language* in the Babylonish captivity; during fourteen generations after, they spoke *Syriac*; and the Protestants themselves admit, that there was no Syriac version of Scripture before the time of Christ. (Raycroft's Ed. of Bible, London, 1655.)

Q. *Do you observe other necessary truths not clearly laid down in Scripture?*

A. The doctrine of the Trinity,—a doctrine the knowledge of which is certainly necessary to salvation,—is not explicitly and evidently laid down in Scripture.

Q. What say you of infant baptism?

A. One-third part of the whole human race, die before their seventh year; it is then a matter of the last importance to know whether infants should be baptized; for the Scripture declares, that baptism is necessary to salvation; and yet the Scripture does nowhere tell us clearly, whether Christ intended infants to be baptized. If it did, why should we have Anabaptists, who have *never been able to see this truth* clearly laid down in Scripture? Here, then, we have a truth, upon which the salvation of one-third part of the whole human race depends, which is not to be found in Scripture.

Q. Did not the Church, at the time of Christ, and before that period, keep the day of rest from five o'clock on Saturday till five on Sunday?

A. Yes; and yet Protestants keep it from twelve to twelve, without any warrant of Scripture. Nay, they oppose the Scripture, Levit. xxiii. 32: "From *even* unto *even* shall you celebrate your Sabbath."

Q. When Protestants do profane work upon Saturday, or the seventh day of the week, do they follow the Scripture as their only rule of faith?

A. On the contrary, they have only the authority of tradition for this practice. In profaning Saturday, they violate one of God's commandments, which he has never clearly abrogated: "Remember thou keep holy the Sabbath-day."

Q. Is the observance of Sunday, as the day of rest, a matter clearly laid down in Scripture?

A. It certainly is not; and yet all Protestants consider the observance of this particular day as essentially necessary to salvation. To say, we observe the Sunday, because Christ rose from the dead on that day, is to say we act without warrant of Scripture; and we might as well say, that we should rest on Thursday, because Christ ascended to heaven on that day, and rested in reality from the work of redemption.

Q. Is it not said, in the Book of Revelations, that St John was in the Spirit on the Lord's day, that is, Sunday; and is not this scriptural proof that Sunday is the day to be observed in the New Law?

A. Are we then to observe this particular day, merely because St John had a revelation upon it? Must we observe, as a day of rest and holiness, any day upon which *an Apostle was in the Spirit?*

Q. But it is called the Lord's day?

A. And is not every day the Lord's day? Does this text tell you not to work upon that day? Does it tell you that

the obligation of keeping Saturday is done away with, or that it was not the day of the Resurrection or Ascension which St John here calls the Lord's day?

Q. *Is it not said in the Acts*—"And upon the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow;" *and is not this sufficient scriptural authority for the observance of the first day of the week?*

A. But does this text abrogate the observance of Saturday the seventh day, or allow Protestants to do profane work on that day? Certainly not. They should then rest upon both days, if they hold the above text as any argument. The text in question does not say that the Apostle preached, or that the people assembled, every first day of the week, but merely on this particular day; for which a good reason is given, namely, that St Paul was to depart next day. It is quite clear, however, that they met every Saturday; for the same Acts say, St Paul preached in the synagogue every Sabbath, and exhorted the Jews and the Greeks. Besides, it is not wonderful that the disciples came together on this first day of the week, since, according to Acts ii., they continued DAILY in the temple breaking bread.

Q. *Does not St Paul order the Galatians and Corinthians to make collections on the first day of the week?*

A. Yes; but, again, this does not abolish the observance of Saturday. St Paul does not say that the people would be at church on that day,—that they were to keep that day, to the exclusion of Saturday, holy,—or that these collections were to be made at church; but merely, that every man should lay up by himself in store upon that day.

Q. *What do you conclude from all this?*

A. That Protestants have no Scripture for the measure of their day of rest; that they abolish the observance of Saturday, without warrant of Scripture; that they substitute Sunday, in its place, without scriptural authority; consequently that for all this, they have only traditional authority. Yet Protestants would look upon a man who would do profane work after five o'clock on Sunday, or keep the Saturday, and profane the first day, as a victim of perdition. Hence we must conclude, that the Scripture, which does not teach these things clearly, does not contain all necessary truths; and, consequently, cannot be the only rule of faith.

SECTION VI.

Q. *Do we find that Protestants really adhere to the Scripture as their only rule of faith?*

A. No; we find the very contrary.

Q. *What is the doctrine of Protestants regarding the commandments of God?*

A. They teach that it is impossible to keep them. "No mere man," say they, "since the fall, is able perfectly to keep the commandments of God."

Q. *What says our Saviour on this subject, in Matth. xi.?*

A. My yoke is sweet, and my hurden is light.

Q. *What says St Luke i. 6, speaking of Zachary and Elisabeth?*

A. "And they were both just before God, walking in ALL the commandments and justifications of the Lord, WITHOUT BLAME." St John, 1 Epistle, ch. v. 3, says: "For this is the charity of God, that we keep his commandments, and his commandments are not heavy." In Deut., ch. xxx., we have: "This commandment that I command thee this day, is not above thee,.....but in thy mouth and in thy heart that thou mayest do it."

Q. *Could a wise God give to his children commandments that he knew they were unable to observe?*

A. Certainly not; for even a master, who would order his slave to carry a burden beyond his strength, would be reputed a fool. Besides, did not the young man in the Scriptures tell Christ himself, that he had kept all the commandments from his youth; and Christ, who knew his heart, did not contradict him, but urged him to other and greater works of love?

Q. *Do you find, from these passages, that the law of God cannot be observed?*

A. No; I find quite the contrary. Protestants, therefore, follow any thing or every thing, but Scripture in this matter.

Q. *What is the doctrine of Protestants on the subject of faith?*

A. They teach that *faith alone justifies* the sinner.

Q. *What does St James say?* (Chap. ii., ver. 17, &c.)

A. "So faith also, if it have not works, is dead in itself,even the devils also believe and tremble." "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, offering up Isaac his son upon the altar?" "Do you see that man is justified by works, and not by faith only." St Paul, 1 Cor., chap. xiii., says: "And if I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." Our Saviour addresses Magdalen thus: "Many sins are forgiven thee, because thou hast loved much."

Q. *What do these texts clearly prove?*

A. That the Protestant doctrine is false,—that their creed

is in direct opposition, to their own boasted rule of faith.

Q. *What is the Protestant doctrine touching good works?*

A. They teach that good works are not at all necessary to salvation.

Q. *What does our Saviour teach on the same subject?* (Mat. x. 17.)

A. That we cannot enter into heaven without good works: "If you would enter into life, keep the commandments." St James, ii. 17, says: "So faith, if it have not works, is dead in itself." St Paul teaches, Rom. ii. 13, that "not the hearers of the law are *just* before God, but the *doers* of the law shall be *justified*." In 2 Peter i. 10, we are told: "Wherefore, brethren, labour the more, that by GOOD WORKS you make sure your calling and election." Jesus Christ himself says, Mat. vii. 21: "Not every one that saith to me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that *doeth* the will of my Father who is in heaven, he shall enter into the kingdom of heaven."

Q. *What is the reason to be given by Christ on the last day, why he shall pronounce the sentence of eternal exile on many of the wicked? Is it only that they had no faith?*

A. No; it is, that they had no charity. Matth. xxv. 41; "Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire,.....for I, was hungry, and *you gave me not to eat*; I was thirsty, and *you gave me not to drink*; I was a stranger, and *you took me not in*; naked, and *you covered me not*; sick, and *in prison, and you did not visit me*."

Q. *What think you now? Is the Protestant doctrine on good works in accordance with Scripture?*

A. No, certainly; on the contrary, it seems invented to set Scripture and reason at defiance.

SECTION VII.

Q. *What is the Protestant doctrine on assurance, or the certainty of grace?*

A. They pretend, that the moment *we believe in Jesus Christ*, we are infallibly assured of God's grace.

Q. *What are we taught in Eccles. ix. 1 and 12?*

A. "There are just men," says that inspired book, "and wise men, and their works, are in the hand of God, and yet man knoweth not whether he be worthy of love or hatred, but *all things are kept uncertain* for the time to come:.....man knoweth not his own end." Solomon, Proverbs xx. 9, asks: "Who can say, *My heart is clean, I am pure from sin?*" St Paul, Phil. ii. 12, says, "Wherefore, my dearly beloved,.... with fear and trembling work out your salvation;" and again,

Cor. iv. 4: "For I am not conscious to myself of any thing, yet I am not hereby JUSTIFIED, but he that judgeth me is the Lord."

Q. Do these texts prove the falsehood of the Protestant doctrine in question?

A. Very clearly indeed. They show it, to be clearly as unscriptural, as it is presumptuous.

Q. But do Catholics believe, that we should always remain in a state of doubt, as to whether we are in a state of grace?

A. Catholics hold, that those who fear God, may have, not the certainty of faith, as Protestants teach, but a moral certainty, that they are in possession of God's grace; but nothing except a revelation from God, who knows the heart, can give us an absolute certainty.

Q. What is the Protestant doctrine on the subject of penitential works?

A. Protestants pretend, that Jesus Christ, has so satisfied for our sins, that, on our part, fasting and other works of penance are entirely useless.

Q. Is it wonderful that Protestantism, should have some professors, since it teaches such a convenient doctrine?

A. Not at all; since such doctrine opens a *wide, easy, and flowery* path to heaven for unrepenting and vicious Christians. According to this, they may serve the devil and serve God at one and the same time.

Q. Does the Scripture teach this doctrine so flattering to the passions?

A. No, certainly; the Prophet Joel, ii. 12, says: "Now, therefore, be converted to me with all your heart, *in fasting, and in weeping, and in mourning.*" The Baptist, Matth. iii. 8, adds: "Bring forth, therefore, worthy fruits of penance." St Luke xiii. 3, our Saviour says: "Unless you do penance, you shall all equally perish." In the 12th chap., he says to those who brought not forth worthy fruits of penance: "Wo to thee, Corozain; wo to thee, Bethsaida; for if in Tyre and Sidon had been wrought the miracles that have been wrought in you, *they had long ago done penance in sackcloth and ashes.*" He tells us elsewhere, that unless we *take up our cross*, and follow him, we cannot be his disciples. St Paul, 1 Cor. ix. 27, says: "I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection." And again we are told: "If we live by the flesh we shall die, but if by the spirit, we mortify the deeds of the flesh, we shall live."

Q. Do you find, by the perusal of these passages, that, according to Scripture, Christ has so satisfied for us, that we may

safely dispense with all crosses, sufferings, mortifications, and works of penance?

A. No; the very reverse is so evident, that a man must be either very ignorant, or blinded by prejudice, not to see it.

Q. *What do Protestants teach as regards the Church?*

A. That she fell into gross errors, and corrupted the purity of the Gospel doctrine of Christ.

Q. *Is this clearly in opposition to Scripture?*

A. Yes; because the Gospel tells us (Matth. xviii. 17), that the Church can never fall into error: "Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall never prevail against it." A rock is its foundation, Christ its builder, and his power, its prop and support. "He that will not hear the Church," says Christ, "is to be reputed as a heathen and a publican." "I will be with you," says Christ, again, to his Apostles and their successors, "*all days*," (that is, each and every day) "to the end of the world." In fine, St Paul calls the Church the *pillar and ground of truth*. 1 Tim. iii. 15.

Q. *What do Protestants teach of the Church?*

A. They teach, that she was invisible, during more than a thousand years, pretending, that there were *always* men who held *their* faith secretly, but that they dared not profess it outwardly.

Q. *Could such a pusillanimous and cowardly body as this, be the Church of Christ?*

A. No; for the people of Christ, must not only *believe with the heart*, but openly *profess with the tongue*. Rom. x. 10: "For with the *heart* we believe unto justice, but with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."

Q. *To what does Christ compare the Church?* (Matth. xviii. 17.)

A. To a city on the top of a mountain, *visible* to all the eyes in the world.

Q. *What do you conclude from these words* (Matth. xviii. 17): "*If he will not hear them, tell the Church?*"

A. That the Church, must have been always visible, otherwise, there must have been a time during which this command of Christ was impossible, on account of the invisibility of the Church; for no one could lay his complaint before an *invisible* Church.

SECTION VIII.

Q. *What do Protestants teach on the subject of the Scripture?*

A. They pretend that the Sacred Volume is so clear, that every one, learned and ignorant, may easily know its meaning.

Q. *Does St Peter think with Protestants in this matter?*

A. No, indeed. In his 2d Epist., iii. 16, he says, that there are some things in the Epistles of St Paul that are hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, as also the *other Scriptures, to their own destruction.*

Q. *Do Protestants teach any other absurdity on the subject of the Scripture?*

A. Yes; they try to persuade their followers, that the Scripture contains all God's revealed will, and that nothing is to be believed or practised, but what is expressly laid down in that Divine Book.

Q. *Is this doctrine in accordance with the Scripture itself?*

A. No; it is directly opposed to the words of St Paul, 2 Thess. ii. 14: "Therefore, brethren, stand fast, and hold the *traditions* which you have been *taught*, whether by word or our Epistle."

Q. *What do Protestants teach on the Eucharist?*

A. It is not an easy matter to answer this question; for to these four words, *this is my body*, each Protestant gives his own peculiar meaning. Some say that the body of Christ is *in* the bread; some, that it is *under* the bread; some, that it is *with* the bread; some, that it has no connection with the bread, but that you receive the body, when you eat the bread; and some, in fine, say, that the body of Christ is not present in any sense whatever,—that the whole affair is a bare *memorial*.

Q. *Are Protestants scriptural in this matter?*

A. No; they teach the very reverse of Scripture. Christ says, "This is my body;" they say, "It is NOT his body."

Q. *How many distinct passages of Scripture are there to prove the real presence?*

A. Fourteen; all contained in the following texts: Mat. xvi. 26, 28; Mark xiv. 22, 24; Luke xxii. 19, 20; 1 Cor. xi. 23, 25; John vi. 51, 60, 66; 1 Cor. x. 16; 1 Cor. xi. 27, 29.

Q. *Is there one text of Scripture which declares the Eucharist, to be mere bread and mere wine?*

A. No, not so much as one; and hence the faith of Protestants on this subject is not only not scriptural, but anti-scriptural.

Q. *What say Protestants of Confession?*

A. That it is an unscriptural, popish practice.

Q. *Is it then unscriptural?*

A. No; the very reverse. St James v. 6, says, "*Confess your sins, one to another.*" The first Christians, under the direction of the Apostles themselves, practised confession, Acts xix. 18, 19: "And many that believed came and con-

fessed, and showed their deeds." See also Num. v. 6, 7, 8; Levit. xii. 15; Matth. iii. 5, 6.

Q. But why confess sin at all?

A. That, according to the law of Christ, those who are penitent may be absolved by the priests of Christ's Church, lawfully sent and ordained.

Q. Do we find in Scripture that any such power was given to the priests of the Church?

A. Yes; we have for this the clearest texts of the Inspired Volume. In John xx. 21, Christ says to his first chosen pastors: "As my Father hath sent ME, even so I send YOU;" and in chap. xvii. 18, of same Gospel: "*As thou hast sent me into the world, even so I have also sent them into the world.*" But Christ was sent into the world with power to forgive sins; therefore, as he communicated to his first pastors the same power, he had himself, they also had power to forgive sins; indeed, he expressly declares it, John xx. 21, 22, 23: "Whose *sins* you shall *forgive*, they are *forgiven* them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." And elsewhere he says: "Whatsoever you shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven."

Q. Are Protestant doctrines equally unscriptural as regards the other Sacraments?

A. Yes; their doctrines are all anti-scriptural as regards these. On Extreme Unction, see James v. 14; on Holy Orders, read 1 Tim. iv. 14; 2 Tim. i. 6; Acts vi. 6, and xiv. 23; on Matrimony, see Ephes. v. 24, 25, 32.

Q. When you read these passages, do you find that Protestants teach scriptural doctrines?

A. No; they evidently teach the very contrary. Their empty vauntings about Scripture, are only deeply-laid schemes to blind the ignorant, and mislead the unwary.

Q. Have you any other proofs that they are not guided by the Scripture?

A. Yes; so many, that we cannot admit more than a mere specimen into this small work. They reject much that is clearly contained in Scripture, and profess more that is nowhere discoverable in that Divine Book.

Q. Give some examples of both.

A. They should, if the Scripture were their only rule, wash the feet of one another, according to the command of Christ, John xiii.; they should receive, what they call the sacrament, *after supper*, and *not* in the morning, because Christ instituted that sacrament at night, and his Apostles received it after

supper; they should not eat blood or strangled meat, because the Apostles forbid it in Acts xv.; they should not baptize infants, as there is no example in Scripture to justify such a practice.

Q. *What inference would you draw from all this?*

A. That Protestants ought rather to call themselves Anti-Evangelicals, than Evangelicals, as their doctrines are opposed to, rather than in conformity with, the Gospel.

CHAPTER VI.

THE TRUE RULE OF FAITH.

SECTION I.

Q. *What are the qualities of the Catholic rule of faith?*

A. The Catholic rule is UNIVERSAL, CERTAIN, and CLEAR, or EASY.

Q. *Why universal?*

A. It is a rule for all, the learned as well as the ignorant; it relieves the former of all doubt and uncertainty, and spares the latter the trouble of a difficult inquiry and examination, for which they are in no way qualified.

Q. *Why do you say it is certain?*

A. Because it is no other than the Word of God, explained by God's appointed organs, in the very sense, intended by the Holy Spirit; and, of course, God can neither deceive nor be deceived.

Q. *Why do you say it is clear?*

A. Because it tells, clearly, in what sense, every portion of God's Word is to be understood.

Q. *What are the peculiar advantages of the Catholic rule of faith?*

A. In the first place, it *banishes all doubt*; secondly, it *decides finally every dispute*; thirdly, it *preserves unity*. When an infallible judge decides, there can be no room, for doubt or division.

Q. *What say you of those who would examine, personally, every controversial point, and abide by what, they in their wisdom think, the Scripture teaches?*

A. That they adopt a rule which, for the great mass of mankind, is an impossibility; because, to form a proper judgment from the Scripture on any controverted point, one should know, in the first place, all the texts of Scripture, that

are for or against such point; secondly, it would be necessary to compare these texts one with the other, to weigh their respective force, to illustrate the obscure, by others more clear; thirdly, to be absolutely certain, that *all* of them are understood in their *true sense*, and no other. Now, this is evidently a business, far beyond the reach, at all events, of the ignorant, who form the great mass of mankind.

Q. *But may not the learned aid the ignorant in this inquiry?*

A. Such is the absurdity to which error always reduces its votaries. You refuse to submit to the decision of the *whole Church*,—to the decision of *all the learned, pious, and enlightened prelates of the Church*, with the sovereign Pontiff at their head, men of all others the best qualified to judge of religious matters; you reject *their* opinion, whilst you would blindly follow the crude notions of *one* layman pretending to learning,* of *one* Calvinistic or Lutheran minister, for the truth of whose opinions you have no security whatever.

SECTION II.

Q. *Do Catholics depend on traditional doctrines, as well as on those that are scriptural or written?*

A. Yes; we believe that what Christ or his Apostles *spoke* is as true as what they *wrote*. It is clear, from what we have seen above, that they delivered many truths by word of mouth, which are not written in the Scripture. These truths are considered authentic and divine, by Catholics, when it is found, that they have been believed, by all Christian nations, and in every age of the Church.

Q. *Does the Scripture authorize this dependence on traditional doctrine?*

A. In 2 Thess. ii. 15, we have: "Hold the *traditions* you have been taught, whether by *word*, or by our epistle." In 2 Cor. iii. 3, it is said: "You are the epistle of Christ, *not written with ink*, but with the Spirit of the living God." Here, what is not *written*, is called the *epistle* of Christ, written with the Spirit of the living God upon the heart, which, though only tradition, most certainly must be as true, as the written Word itself.

Q. *Have you any other texts to the same effect?*

A. 2 Thess. iii. 6: "Withdraw yourselves from every brother, that walketh disorderly, and not after the *tradition* which ye have received of us." See Rom. vi. 17; 1 Cor. xi. 2; Tim. vi. 20; Tim. i. 13, where it is said, "Hold fast the form of *sound words* which thou hast heard of me." 1 Thess. ii. 13: "When ye received the *Word of God*, which ye heard

of us, ye received it, not as the word of men, but" (as it is in truth) "*the Word of God.*"

Q. *How can you distinguish true from false tradition?*

A. As easily as, you can distinguish, a true from a false copy of Scripture. In both cases, you must depend on the uniform and universal testimony of Christian antiquity. You hold your Bible, to be the Word of God, because all Christian ages and nations have done so before you; and you have the very same testimony, for the traditional doctrines, held as divine by the Catholic Church. We have as much evidence, for the truth of universally-admitted traditional doctrine, as we have for the truth, and authenticity, and divinity, of the four Gospels.

Q. *Does not our Saviour say: "Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life?"* (John v. 39.)

A. Yes; but he does not say in them, ye *have certainly* eternal life. This argument would prove, that the *Old Testament*, without the *New*, was sufficient; for, at this time, not *one word of the New Testament was written*. In 2 Tim. iii. 15, we are told, that all Scripture is profitable, and that it maketh wise unto salvation; but what Catholic ever denied this? This text does not say, that the Scripture *alone* maketh wise, as to everything necessary. The book of Genesis makes men wise, but will this one book make men wise in every religious truth? St Paul praises Timothy, because he had read the Scriptures from his youth; but then Timothy was a bishop, whose duty it was, not only to read, but to expound the Scripture.

Q. *What say you to Deut. iv. 2: "You shall not add to the word which I speak, nor take away from it?"*

A. At this time nothing but the Mosaic law was written; hence, this passage in the mouth of a Protestant proves, that he believes the Mosaic law, sufficient as a rule of faith. But what will he say to the Prophets and Apostles, who afterwards added all the rest of the Old and New Testaments? It is not what is added by inspired men that is here condemned, but what is *contrary* to that, which God had already revealed, for God does not condemn the good institutions of men. 2 Chron. xxx. 21, after the children of Israel, according to law, had kept the solemnity of Azymes seven days (ver. 23), the whole assembly took good counsel, to keep other seven days, and yet, though this was a human addition (ver. 27), "their prayer came to the holy habitation of heaven." Thus, also, Christ himself (John x. 22) keeps the feast of the dedication,

mentioned in 1st Macehab. iv. 56, though this book is not admitted by Protestants, to be Scripture at all.

Q. *Does not St John, at the end of Apocalypse, the last book of Scripture, say: "If any man shall add to these things, God shall add unto him the plagues written in this book?"* (Chap. xxii. 18.)

A. The Apocalypse, though *placed* last in order, was not last *written*. St John wrote his Gospel some years after his liberation from the Isle of Patmos, where the Apocalypse was composed; hence, as St John, according to the Protestant sense of the words above quoted, would himself incur the curse, it is evident that he merely threatens, with that curse any one who should dare to vitiate, by addition or subtraction, the book which he there concludes,—that is, the book of the Apocalypse. He ends his Gospel by declaring (John xxi. 25), that our Lord did much, that was not written; and surely the witnesses of these doings were not accursed for relating and believing what they had seen, or heard from the lips of Christ, although these things were never written. The Thessalonians had tradition (2 Thess. ii. 14); Timothy had a form of *sound words* (2 Tim. i. 13); and were they, or are we, to be visited by the plagues, because, in obedience to St Paul, we hold these traditions, in addition, to what God commanded to be written? It is therefore a mere Protestant gloss, unauthorized by the text itself, and in contradiction to the rest of the Scripture, to assert, that we are to believe nothing except what is written.

SECTION III.

Q. *What is the rule of faith adopted by Catholics?*

A. All truly inspired Scripture, and all truly divine tradition, interpreted by the teaching body of the Church,—that is, by the pastors to whom Christ said, "Go, *teach* all nations." This teaching body, when taken collectively with the chief Pastor at their head, all Catholics believe to be infallible,—that is, that they cannot teach any error against faith or morals. Now, if this great fundamental truth, be clearly laid down in Scripture, then Catholics will be quite safe in following the teaching of their pastors; then the *teaching* body will be, to the *taught*, an infallible rule of faith. Mark well, we do not maintain that the pastors of the Church are, of themselves, infallible, but that God has made them so, for the benefit of his people, and that Christ himself teaches, by their lips.

Q. *What proof have you to advance for all this?*

A. In Isaiah ii. 3, Christ is represented as teaching the

Church : "He will teach us his ways, and we shall walk in his paths."* That Church must be infallible in its teaching, which has Christ as its director, and whose children walk in the paths of the Saviour.

Q. *What do we find in Isaiah liv. 17 ?*

A. That no weapon, which is formed against the Church of Christ, shall prosper ; and that every tongue which resisteth her in judgment, she shall condemn. Surely she must be infallible, if she triumph over every enemy, and have power from God to condemn every tongue that opposes her decisions. In Isaiah lx. 12, it is said, "that the nation and kingdom, that will not serve her, shall perish." Now, could nations be compelled to serve the Church, if she could lead them astray, and teach them error ?

Q. *Do we find any thing of importance to our purpose in Ezechiel xlv. 23 ?*

A. "They" (the priests) "shall teach my people, what is, between a holy thing and a thing polluted, and the difference between clean and unclean, they shall show them ; and when there shall be a controversy, they shall stand in judgment, and shall judge according to my judgments." The judgment of the priests of the Most High must then be infallible, since they are ACCORDING to the judgment of God himself.

Q. *What have we in Psalm cxxxii. 13 ?*

A. We have : "Our Lord hath chosen Zion : he hath chosen it for an habitation to himself. This is my rest for ever and ever : here will I dwell ; because I have chosen it." Now, according to St Paul, 1 Tim. iii. 15, Christ's dwelling-place is his Church : "That thou mayest know how to converse in the house of God, the Church of the living God." It must be manifest, then, that the Church of Christ is pure and free from error ; for, were she the mother and mistress of idolatry, the pure God of heaven could never have chosen her for his dwelling-place.

Q. *What says Isaiah liv. 4 ?*

A. "Fear not," says the Almighty, addressing the Church, "for thou shalt not be ashamed, neither be thou confounded, for thou shalt not be put to shame." If, as Protestants pretend, the Church became idolatrous, surely she must have been put to shame ; and, in this case, the words of the Almighty are supposed false, which is evident blasphemy.

* Our Protestant brethren have only to refer to their own Bible, and note the titles of its chapters, to be satisfied, that this and the following passages, quoted from the Old Testament, have a direct reference to the Church of Christ, whose infallibility they foretell in the most explicit terms.

Q. *Is there not a still more brilliant testimony to the infallibility of the Christian Church, in the same Prophet, ix. 15?*

A. Yes: "I will make thee an *ETERNAL* excellence." Would the Church be an *eternal excellence*, if, after a few centuries' duration, she had fallen into the depths of idolatry? And in verse 18: "Thou shalt call thy walls *salvation*; our Lord shall be unto thee an *everlasting light*; thy sun shall go down *no more*, and thy moon shall be *no more* diminished." Now, could it be said of an idolatrous Church, that her walls were salvation,—that the infallible Deity was her *everlasting light*,—that her sun should set *no more*, nor her moon withdraw her light? According to these texts, either the Church is perpetual, pure, and infallible, or God is a false prophet. In chap. lxii. 3, she is called "*a crown of glory, the delight of the Almighty*;" and in ver. 12, she is called, "*a city sought for and not forsaken*;" and could she be either the one or the other, if she had, as Protestants pretend, fallen into idolatry and superstition?

Q. *What says Ezech. xxxiv. 22?*

A. "I will save my flock, and it shall be no more a spoil." Could the flock be saved from spoil, if the Church teaching that flock were full of error, and buried in idolatry, for upwards of a thousand years, as Protestants contend? Surely that Church is infallible, in which God himself saves the flock from spoil.

Q. *Is not this infallibility clearly laid down in Isaiah lxi. 8?*

A. Yes, very clearly. "I will direct their work in *truth*," says the Lord, of his Christian pastors, "and I will make an *everlasting covenant* with them,"—for preserving this *never-failing truth*. Surely nothing could more explicitly point out the infallibility of the future Christian Church. Again, in xxxv. 5, it is said, that in the time of Christ's Church, "the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and a highway shall be there, and it shall be called the way of holiness,...so that fools shall not err therein." Now, if the Church were idolatrous or superstitious, could she be called a way of holiness,—a way in which even fools could not err?

Q. *Do we not find a very strong text in Isaiah lix. 20?*

A. Yes; there the Almighty makes a covenant with his Church, which places her infallibility beyond all doubt. "There shall come," says he, "a Redeemer to Zion, and to them that shall return from iniquity in Jacob; as for me, this is my covenant with them: *My Spirit that is in thee, and my words that I have put in thy mouth*, shall not depart out of thy mouth, nor out of the mouth of thy seed, nor out of the

mouth of thy seed's seed, from *henceforth and for ever*." Surely a Church, with the Word of God in her mouth, with the Spirit of God as her guide, and having the word of heaven that these shall remain with her *for ever*, must be infallible—can teach no error.

Q. *What say you to the words of Jeremiah xxxii. 39, where God says of his Christian Church: "I will give them one heart and one way, that they may fear me for ever; I will put my fear in their hearts, that they shall not depart from me?"*

A. Protestants should see here how false is the assertion, that after three or four hundred years' duration, the Church of Christ fell into idolatry. That Church is to *fear God for ever*, and never to depart from God. In Ezec. xxxvii. 24, the Almighty says: "They shall walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes, and do them. I will make a covenant of peace with them; it shall be an *everlasting* covenant with them; I will set my sanctuary in the midst of them *for evermore*." We here ask any reasoning Protestant, if an idolatrous Church can observe God's statutes; can He make an *everlasting* peace with such a Church; or can it be even imagined, that He could place his holy sanctuary in the midst of a mass of idolatry and superstition *for evermore*?

SECTION IV.

Q. *Have you any arguments from the New Testament?*

A. Yes, many.

Q. *What do you observe on Matth. xviii. 17: "If he will not hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen and a publican?"*

A. We ask, could a good God, who came to teach truth, and to save men by the belief of truth, give such a command as this, if the Church, which he appointed to teach, were an idolatrous Church? Suppose, for a moment, that Church teaching even one error; does not Christ, in the above text, command all to believe *that error* under pain of being as heathens and publicans, for whom there is no salvation? If this supposition be not blasphemous, I know not what is; and yet such is the language of every Protestant. By rejecting the infallibility of the teaching body of the Church, they evidently make the Saviour command his people to believe idolatry; as the Church, according to them, fell into it, and taught it, soon after Christ left the world.

Q. *Have you any remark to make on the next verse—Matth. xviii. 18—where Christ says to the teachers in his Church: "Whosoever you shall bind on earth, shall he bound in*

heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven?"

A. If these teachers could *err* in loosing or binding, then Christ has sworn to err in ratifying; but the consequence is blasphemy, therefore the premises are untenable; hence the teaching Church can teach no error; hence she is infallible.

Q. *Do you here suppose the teachers individually infallible, or that they are free, personally, from all sin and error?*

A. By no means; philosophically speaking, if all the bishops of the Church, scattered over all the nations of the earth, all men of learning and probity, who have never seen one another,—who have had no means of combining to teach any particular doctrine,—and who have had no motive for such, do actually teach the very same truths, then we maintain, that their combined testimony to the existence of any doctrine infallibly proves its truth. This, however, is not what we contend for here: we maintain our teaching body to be infallible, because God has made them so; as in the Old Law he made the scribes and Pharisees, who were the public ministers of his Church (though often, no doubt, personally sinners), infallible, for the safety of those whom they taught. That these teachers of the ancient Church were infallible, is more than evident from Matth. xxiii. 1: "Upon the chair of Moses have sitten the scribes and Pharisees; *all therefore whatsoever they shall say unto you, observe and do.*" Were they not *infallible teachers*, even God could not command us to *obey* them; and surely no one would make the teachers of the better Christian Church inferior to these.

Q. *Did not the Apostles and first Christians act on this teaching as infallible?*

A. Yes; in Acts xv. 2, Paul and Barnabas, and certain others, went up to Jerusalem, to have a disputed question of religion, authoritatively decided. They had no Scripture to guide them, yet, after *great disputation*, they, as the teaching body, determined the point, declaring that their decision was the decision of the Holy Ghost: "It seemeth good to the Holy Ghost and to us;" and this decision was obeyed by all, as the infallible decree of heaven.

Q. *Is it not manifest, from Gal. ii. 1, that the first Christians reposed no confidence in any authority but the Church teaching?*

A. It is; even St Paul, after teaching and preaching fourteen years, goes up to Jerusalem. "I went up," says he, "according to revelation, and conferred" (compared) "with them, the Gospel which I preach among the Gentiles." St

Paul does not take the Scripture here as his only rule ; no, no ; he draws his light from the infallible teaching of the Church.

Q. *Does not St Paul*—Ephes. iv. 11—*supply us with a very strong argument* : “ He gave some Apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and teachers, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, until we all meet in the unity of faith ? ”

A. This, certainly, is a strong passage. Here the Bible is not employed to perfect the saints, to edify the body of Christ ; but a body of living teachers are pointed out, and these must be infallible in their doctrine, otherwise they would neither *perfect* nor edify the body of Christ.

Q. *What say you on* Matth. xvi. 18 : “ The gates of hell shall not prevail against it ” (the Church) ?

A. In this passage, Christ is the architect or builder : “ On this rock *I will build my Church.* ” A rock is the foundation ; and Christ declares, that even all the power of hell, shall never prevail against her. Who, then, will dare to assert, that this Church, with such a foundation, such an architect, and such a promise, is fallible,—that she may fall into idolatry ? Either she cannot fail, or Christ is only a false and impotent prophet.

Q. *Is not the infallibility of the Church clearly pointed out in* Matth. xxviii. 18, 19, 20, *where it is said* : “ *All power is given to me in heaven and in earth ; going therefore, teach all nations, ... teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you ; and behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world ?* ”

A. Christ here sends his pastors to teach *all nations*, and to teach them until *the end* of the world. He knew well that his Apostles could not do this of themselves ; for twelve mortal men could not teach *every where* and *always* until the consummation of the world. When, therefore, Christ sent these first teachers, he sent, with them, all their chosen assistants and successors ; for surely Christ did not come merely to secure safe teachers to those who lived in the time of the Apostles. Now, he says he has all power ; therefore he *can* make his *teachers infallible*. He, the God of truth, sends them to *teach* all nations ; and surely he does not send them to *teach error* ! *He will be with them*, he says, *all days*, and, beyond all doubt, he will be with them, to preserve them at all times from teaching even the smallest error : for he could not be with an idolatrous Church. Hence, as *Christ himself*

is the *guide* of the Church, and this *in every age*, she can obviously teach no error; hence she is infallible.

Q. *What says St Paul*—1 Tim. iii. 15?

A. He calls the visible Church, in which Timothy is a teacher, "THE CHURCH OF THE LIVING GOD, THE PILLAR AND GROUND OF TRUTH." What man will dare attempt to give these clear words even two probable explanations? She is, says an Apostle, the *Church of the living God*, therefore she can teach no error. She is *the pillar and ground of truth*; could she be so, if she taught idolatry or superstition?

Q. *We admit, you may say, that the Church was infallible until the Scripture was written, but after that period the Scripture became the infallible rule?*

A. Christ does not tell you, that his Church will be infallible, only for a time,—he declares, she will be so until the end of time; nor does St Paul say, that the Church will *ever* cease to be the pillar and ground of truth. The Scriptures are, beyond doubt, an infallible rule, to the extent of the revealed truth contained in them, but they are infallible *only* in themselves, and not with regard to us, unless we are prepared to say, that the meaning we give them is infallibly correct, and that this cannot be, we have only to consider how Protestants contradict one another in interpreting Scripture. The Bible, then, cannot be an infallible rule, unless your understanding of it be infallibly right; but of this you can never be certain, unless you have it interpreted for you, by an infallible judge; and this, as you must see, supposes the existence of an infallible Church.

Q. *In Luke x. 16, what do we find?*

A. "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me." He who heareth the teaching of Christ, heareth infallible teaching; but Christ, who cannot deceive, declares, that he who *heareth his pastors, heareth himself*; therefore their doctrine, being that of Christ, is infallible.

Q. *Does not the Apostle*—Gal. i. 8—*assume, that the teaching of the pastors is infallibly correct?*

A. Certainly; for he declares, that even an *angel from heaven* is not to be believed, if he teach a doctrine, contrary to that preached, by the pastors of the Church.

Q. *Have we not a most conclusive passage in* John xiv. 16, 17, *and* xvi. 13: "And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you for ever, the Spirit of truth... You shall know him, because he

shall abide with you and in you ; but when he, the *Spirit of truth*, is come, he will teach you all truth ?

A. Here the teaching body of the Church are to be directed by the *Spirit of truth*, who is to teach them all truth, and for ever. They must then be infallible guides.

Q. Does not Christ call his Apostles the light of the world ?

A. Yes ; and upon these words we argue in the following manner. The light, sent by Christ to enlighten the world, could not lead into darkness or error ; but the Apostles and their lawful successors were such light ; therefore they could not lead mankind astray.

Q. We admit, say some of our reformed brethren, that the Apostles were infallible, but we cannot make the same admission as to the pastors who succeeded them ?

A. You must, we reply, either admit the latter, or you must make Christ a respecter of persons, who gave to the first Christians infallible teachers in the Apostles, and left all the rest of mankind to the direction of erring men. Christ surely makes us as secure as the first Christians ; he loves us, as he loved them.

Q. Can you strengthen your cause by a reference to Ephes. chap. v ?

A. Yes. The Church is described there as the spouse of Christ ; Christ has sanctified her, and loved her, and presented her to himself, without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, and made her holy and without blemish. Now, this Church must be free from error, otherwise Christ could not sanctify her, nor could he love her, if she was idolatrous : her holiness, without spot or blemish, is a certain pledge of her infallibility. "Obey your prelates," says St Paul, "for they watch, as being to render an account for your souls." Now, how could the Almighty, by his Apostle, order us to hear and obey men, unless he knew that these men could teach us no error ? "Take heed to yourselves," says the same Apostle to the pastors of the Church, "and to your whole flocks, wherein the Holy Ghost has placed you bishops, to rule the Church of God." Could the Holy Ghost subject his people in this world to the rule and direction of men, who might—and, according to Protestants, did—teach error, idolatry, and superstition ?

Q. Must not the rule of faith, given by the Almighty to mankind, have been an easy rule ?

A. Yes ; because it was intended for the ignorant as well as the learned. Wherever the Christian Church existed,

there were Christian pastors, for we cannot suppose a flock without shepherds; hence, the teaching of these living guides was always within reach of their people. The mode of acquiring instruction is a "path in which fools cannot err;" not so the Bible, about the interpretation of which even the most learned, dispute and differ, and which, until the invention of printing, fourteen hundred years after Christ, could not be, within the reach of the people at all; and to those, who were unable to read, could be no rule at all.

Q. Was the Jewish, as well as the Christian Church, infallible?

A. As long as it was the decree of heaven that the Jewish Church should exist, she was, by the teaching of her pastors, infallible, as a guide to her people. During the first two thousand four hundred years of the world, there was no Scripture: God's people—Seth, Abraham, Isaac, Israel, Job, Melchizedic—were saved by the teaching, which must have been infallible, of the patriarchs. In Dent. xxxi. the Levites are ordered to read and expound the Scripture to the people; but the Scripture is not put into the hands of the people. In the same Book, chap. xvii., all are commanded, under pain of death, to have recourse to the pastors of the Church in every controversy. In 2 Paralip. (2 Chron. xix.): "Amarias, your high priest, shall be CHIEF in the things which regard God." In Malac. ii. 7, the people are commanded to seek the law from the lips of the priesthood. Now, surely these commands, to obey the pastors, or teachers, in the Jewish Church, evidently suppose that body to be infallible, for a good God could not command his people, under pain of death, to obey men who might lead them into error.

Q. Was the Church of Christ to be so universal, that all its children might be within reach of its teaching?

A. St John, Apoc. vii. 9, besides twelve thousand of every tribe of Israel, saw a great multitude, *which no man could number*, of all nations, tribes, people, and tongues. Ps. ii. 8: "Ask of me, and I will give thee the Gentiles for thy inheritance, and the ends of the earth for thy possession." Ps. xxii. 27: "All the ends of the earth shall remember and be converted to the Lord." Ps. lxxii. 7: "He shall rule from sea to sea,...yea, all the kings of the earth shall adore him, and all nations shall serve him." And in the New Testament, the Church is represented as a city on the top of a mountain,—as a light which cannot be hid; whilst Christ commissions his Apostles to teach *all nations*. The teaching of the Church, then, is within reach of all, as the Church is

visible to all; but no one in his senses will say the same of the Bible, whose existence, in the hands of the people, was an impossibility during most of the time, that has elapsed since the establishment of Christianity.

SECTION V.

Q. May not some reasoning Protestant here say: You have given a very plausible interpretation of these passages of Scripture in favour of the infallibility of the Church of Christ; but how are we to know that yours is the true interpretation,—that these texts mean exactly what you say?

A. Here we have a sensible person to reason with, and we request him to beg the Almighty to enlighten his mind; we beg him to solicit this grace through the all-powerful mediation of the incarnate and crucified God; we beseech him also to recollect, that there is a thick mist of long-fostered prejudice to be removed,—that the effects of early education are to be overcome,—pride and self-love to be curbed and repressed. Let him give these texts an attentive re-consideration, and then weigh, impartially, the following reflections.

1st, The following rule of criticism has been universally received: "Every explanation must be clearer than the thing explained." The texts, then, in question, by the chapter titles of the Protestant Bible, evidently refer to the Christian Church; on this head, therefore, there can be no dispute. These texts say, that, in the Christian Church, the *Lord will teach us his ways*, that our path shall be so plain that *even fools cannot err in it*, that God will never be *wroth with his Church*, that she shall be *founded in justice*, that her *children shall be taught of the Lord*, &c. &c. Now, what interpretation can be so clear as that which I gave these texts—that the Church, of which they were spoken, must be free from error? And what inference could be more forced and unnatural than this, which Protestants draw, that a Church, with these splendid and glorious attributes,—a Church which has God as her teacher, his Spirit her guide, and his Word ever in her mouth,—should be liable to teach error, or fall into idolatry?

The inference which I drew from the New Testament evidences is still more natural: *I will build my Church upon a rock,—the gates of hell shall not prevail against her,—I will be with her all days even to the consummation of the world,—she is the pillar and ground of truth,—my Holy Spirit will teach her all truth for ever.* Is not the interpretation of these passages, in favour of infallibility, easy, natural, and obvious; and would not any interpretation of them, in favour of falli-

bility, be forced, conjectural, and whimsical, and much less clear than the texts themselves?

2dly, Our next reason for the admission of the Catholic interpretation is this: We have, for this interpretation, the almost unanimous testimony and collective judgment of all ages, of all nations, of all Christian people; and surely this ought to be preferred, to the private interpretation of one fallible man; for this, in fact, is the Protestant rule,—each Protestant is bound to follow the interpretation *he himself* thinks best. If there is wisdom among many counsellors, and if Christ is in the midst of even two or three gathered together in his name, surely any interpretation, universally believed by the Catholic Church, spread over all nations, and existing in all ages, is preferable to the interpretation of any one individual, how learned soever he may be.

3dly, Our interpretation should be admitted, if I can prove, that the Protestant mode of interpretation, ought to be rejected; truth lies between us: the one must be right; the other wrong. Now, that mode of interpretation is bad in theory, which its advocates are obliged to abandon in practice. But such is the Protestant mode; it supports the right of private judgment, as the great palladium of Gospel liberty. When, therefore, Protestant Churches interfere with, or restrain this liberty, they abandon their system in practice. But the Church of England excommunicates, the Church of Scotland excommunicates, for doctrinal errors. Now, is this reconcileable, with the right of private judgment? This right, they say, is from Christ; those who use it, are responsible only to Christ; and if so, no Protestant Church has a right to judge, of its use or its abuse, for that is the very power they deny to the infallible Church. Protestants authorize each man to interpret, and then excommunicate and depose him for doing what they authorize; hence, their principle is bad; they hold in theory, what they are obliged to abandon in practice. What, indeed, are their signatures to the thirty-nine articles and the Athanasian Creed,—their denunciations of Dissenters and Unitarians,—their suspensions of Pusey and others,—but a practical abandonment of the empty boast of Protestantism—the right of private judgment?

4thly, That mode of interpretation must be the correct one, which is sanctioned by the example of the Apostles, and practised by the primitive Church. But both these appealed, not to *private* judgment, but to the judgment of the teaching Church, for the truth of their doctrines. When certain teachers at Antioch disputed with Paul and Barnabas con-

cerning the necessity of circumcision, did they appeal each to his private judgment, or to the Scripture privately interpreted? No; they sent a deputation with Paul and Barnabas to consult the *pastors* of the Church at Jerusalem. The Judeans and Antiochians, led by private judgment, believed circumcision necessary; Paul and Barnabas thought otherwise. They appeal, not to the Bible, but to the teaching body of the Church; and, under the direction of the Holy Ghost, the point is decided by this body. Now, if the Scripture alone were the only rule, the Antiochians were guilty of a heinous sin in abandoning that rule, and the Apostles were equally criminal in deciding by any other.

5thly, That mode of interpretation is true which was adopted during the first five centuries; during which period even Protestants admit that the Church was pure and free from error. Now, when Arius denied the Divinity of Christ, there was no appeal to private judgment; a general Council was called in the year 325, and thus was condemned, by the body of living teachers, the impious doctrine of Arius,—a doctrine which may be styled the first monster produced by the principle of private interpretation.

6thly, Such as the above, was the principle adopted by all the Fathers of the first five centuries. St Irenæus (*Adv. Hæres. L. iv. c. 45*), who lived in the second century, says: "God appointed in his Church, Apostles, prophets, and doctors; where, therefore, the holy gifts of God are, *there must the truth be learned.*" And again, cap. lii. p. 355; "To this man all things will be plain, if he read diligently the Scriptures, *with the aid of those who are the priests in the Church, and in whose hands rests the doctrine of the Apostles.*" Origen, of the third century, says, (*Præf. Lib. i. Periarchon*): "Many think they believe what Christ taught, and some of these differ from others;...all should profess that doctrine which came down from the Apostles, and now continues in the Church; that alone is truth which in nothing differs from what is thus delivered." St Hilary, in the fourth century, says, the ship from which Christ preached "is an emblem of the Church, within which is the word of life placed and preached." "I would not," says St Augustine (*Contra Epist. Fund.*) in the fifth century, "I would not give credit to the Gospel, unless the authority of the Church induced me to it; for," says he, *Contra Faust*, "the authority of our sacred books is confirmed by the consent of nations, through the succession of Apostles, bishops, and councils."

SECTION VI.

Q. Does reason, which is the handmaid of Scripture, speak out clearly in favour of infallibility?

A. Yes; very clearly and decidedly.

Q. What does reason tell us of a fallible Church?

A. That, as such a church may teach error, it is evidently unworthy of a good and merciful God.

Q. Does not our salvation depend on the truth of our faith, and the rectitude and purity of our morals?

A. Yes; without faith we cannot please God, and if we would enter into life, we must keep the commandments. Now, how can any one be certain either of the truth of his faith, or the purity of his morals, so long as he has only a fallible Church, which may teach error, as his guide?

Q. Can the child of a fallible church have true faith?

A. No; as he must ever doubt whether his Church teaches truth, and can have no certainty, as to any one article she teaches; so his faith, ever accompanied with doubt, can be only mere human opinion.

Q. Does not the idea of a fallible Church militate against the goodness and wisdom of God?

*A. A good God, who has been so solicitous to save us, could not surely commit us, to the blind guidance of mere human reason or opinion; nor could such an uncertain mean for our safety, be devised by an all-wise Being.**

Q. Is not this clear, even from the love God bears for us?

A. Yes; if he loves us so, as to have sent his only Son to die for us, surely, having done so much, he could not commit us to the blind guidance, of an erring, fallible teacher.

Q. What inference do you draw from all this?

A. That, to have true faith, we must have a teacher that cannot err; a fallible teacher of any kind may err; Christ does not teach us himself personally; his Apostles have long since left the world; the Scripture, privately interpreted, is made, as we see daily, to teach every absurdity. Therefore, the infallible teacher we so absolutely require, can be no other than the teaching body of the true Church of Christ.

Q. May it not be still urged that the Scripture is an infallible teacher?

A. We admit that the Scripture is an infallible teacher, if your interpretation of it be infallibly right; but until you have it explained by an infallible interpreter, you must remain in doubt as to its true meaning; consequently, though, in itself, the Bible is infallible, with regard to you, it is still a fallible rule, unless it be explained by an infallible interpreter;

and an infallible interpreter supposes the existence of an infallible Church.

CHAPTER VII.

ON THE TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

SECTION I.

Q. You have now proved very clearly, that the Protestant rules of faith are all false; that they reduce faith to mere human opinion: You have also proved, by many and convincing arguments, that the Church of Christ, whatever and wherever she be, is infallible; Please, now, to point out that Church to us?

A. I shall endeavour to do so, with as much perspicuity as the brevity to which I must confine myself will permit; and, in this inquiry, let God's holy grace and word be our guides; let us beg of Him to enable us to lay aside prejudice, to forget ourselves and the world, and with candid minds and pure hearts, to seek only Him and his holy truth.

Q. Can any one be saved who is not in the true Church?

A. No; for those who are not in the true Church,—that is, for those who are not joined, at least, to the soul of the Church,*—there can be no hope of salvation.

Q. What says Christ upon this subject? (Matth. chap. xviii.)

A. That he who will not hear the Church, is to be reputed as a heathen.

Q. What says St Cyprian? (Lib. de Unit. Eccl.)

A. "That he who has not the Church for his mother, cannot have God for his father;" and the Fathers generally say, "that as all, who were not in the ark of Noah, perished in the waters of the deluge; so shall all perish, who are without the pale of the true Church."

Q. What is the meaning of the ninth article of the Creed: "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church?"

A. That every one should firmly believe, that to be a member of the Catholic Church, is necessary in order to salvation.

Q. By what marks can you distinguish the true Church from all other sects?

A. Very particularly by two: 1st, Whatever pretends to be the Church of Christ, must have been established, upwards of *eighteen hundred years ago*, by Christ and his

* This question as it regards Pagans and invincibly ignorant Christians, will be treated afterwards.

Apostles. 2nd, It must have existed *unceasingly* in the world from that time, to the present.

Q. *Why do you say that Christ's Church must have been established more than eighteen hundred years ago?*

A. Because it was Christ who established *his own true Church*, and it is more than eighteen hundred years, since he left the world, to which he has never since visibly returned.

Q. *Why do you say that a Church, to be the true Church of Christ, must have perpetually existed, without any interruption, since the time Christ established it?*

A. Simply, because Christ promised such perpetuity to *his Church*.

Q. *What are the words of Christ on this subject?* (Matth xvi. 18; and xxviii. 20.)

A. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" and, "Go, therefore, teach all nations.....and lo! I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."

Q. *How does St Paul speak of the Church of Christ?* (1 Tim. iii.)

A. He calls her the *pillar and ground of truth*.

Q. *Were it true that the Church had in reality fallen into idolatry, what inference would you draw from that fact?*

A. That Christ was an unskilled architect and a false prophet; because he must then have built his Church, not upon a rock, but upon sand, like that foolish architect of whom he himself speaks, Matth. viii.; and because the gates of hell would then have really prevailed against the Church, in spite of his prediction.

Q. *What conclusion do you draw from all this?*

A. That Christ established a Church; that, that Church has existed in every age; that she exists at present; that she never could, and never can, fall into any error dangerous to salvation, on matters of faith or morality; that every one, in fine, is bound with a firm and unshaken faith, to believe what she teaches, because her doctrines are, like her Divine Master, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

SECTION II.

Q. *In what Church do you find, those two certain marks of truth, of which you have spoken?*

A. In the Catholic Church, and in no other.

Q. *Was she established eighteen hundred years ago?*

A. Yes; for no man has ever yet been able, to date her origin, at any later period.

Q. Has she existed always, without even the least interruption, during that time?

A. Yes; and no one has ever ventured to point out such interruption, or how long, if it took place at all, such interruption lasted.

Q. How does St Augustine establish this necessary antiquity and perpetuity, of the Church up to his own time? (Epist. a Gener.)

A. He proves it, by the uninterrupted succession of Roman Pontiffs, whose names he gives, one after the other, for the complete period, to the number of thirty-nine.

Q. How many Popes have governed the Church from St Peter to the present Pontiff, Pius IX., inclusively?

A. Two hundred and fifty-seven.

Q. Are the two certain marks of the true Church, of which you have spoken, discoverable in the Protestant Church?

A. No; neither in the Episcopal nor Calvinistic branch of it.

Q. How long is it since the Lutheran Church was established?

A. About three hundred years: Luther preached the first Protestantism ever known, in 1517; and Calvinism was first preached, in the year 1537.

Q. Were there no Lutheran or Calvinistic Churches before these dates?

A. No; no such doctrines, nor churches, nor pastors, nor sects, were ever known in any country, prior to that time.

Q. How do you reason from these facts against your adversaries?

A. Any Church, to be the true Church, must have been established eighteen hundred years ago; but the Episcopalian and Presbyterian Churches are only of three hundred years duration; therefore, neither of them can have any pretension to be the Church of Christ.

Q. May not your adversaries reply, that the Church of the first four centuries believed as they do; that, at the end of that time, the Church fell into superstition and idolatry; and that God judged it necessary, after the Church was drowned in error for eleven hundred years, to send Luther and Calvin to reform her?

A. Yes, they may, and do advance many absurdities, and this is one of them, which does not bring them out of their difficulties; for Christ says, his Church cannot fail; that the gates of hell shall never prevail against her; that his *Holy Spirit shall teach her all truth* FOR EVER; that he will abide with her ALL DAYS, even to the consummation of the world.

Therefore it is an infallible truth, than any Church, to be the Church of Christ, must have been established eighteen hundred years ago; therefore that Church, once established, could not fail; therefore the Protestant Church, the mere child of yesterday, cannot be the Church of Christ; therefore her very foundation, is nothing but error and blasphemy, for she is built on the supposition, that Christ was either UNWILLING or UNABLE to *keep his promise*,—a supposition which implies the most aggravated blasphemy, tantamount to a denial of the Divinity of Christ.

SECTION III.

Q. What question can you put to a Protestant, to which he can give no satisfactory reply?

A. Ask him, where the true Church was before the time of Luther and Calvin.

Q. May he not reply, that the Church was then invisible, that there were Christians in every age, who held the doctrines of Luther and Calvin, but that they dared not openly profess their faith?

A. Yes; but this answer will satisfy only fools; for surely, it must be evident, to every one who thinks, that men who believed in their hearts one creed, and professed another, like these INVISIBLE Protestants, were only hypocrites, dastardly traitors to their religion, utterly incapable of composing the holy, fearless body of the true Church of Christ.

Q. Was not the Jewish Church for a time invisible, and did not God say to the prophet Elias, that there were seven thousand men concealed, who had never bent the knee to Baal?

A. When the Jewish Church was invisible in the kingdom of Israel, it was in a most flourishing state in the land of Judah; but the Protestant Church existed in no kingdom, during the years of its invisibility, nor have we the Word of God assuring us, that there were seven thousand invisible Protestants concealed under a cloud any where.

Q. Have you any other reply to make?

*A. Yes; there is a very great difference between the Christian and the Jewish Church: God never promised that he would be with the Jewish Church *all days*, that the gates of hell should not prevail against her.*

Q. Have you any other way of proving, that the true Church must have been always visible?

*A. If the Church had not been always visible, it would have been impossible to obey the command of Christ, that we should *hear and obey his Church*. The Church is composed*

of men teaching and men taught, and are these invisible? Are preaching, public prayer, baptism, the administration of the other sacraments, duties that can be performed invisibly? Is not the subterfuge of an invisible Church a mere absurdity? May not any Mormon, Mucker, or madman, declare his nostrums, to be the true religion, hitherto invisible, now at length revealed?

Q. *Is it not clear, from Scripture, that the true Church must ever be visible?*

A. Yes; for the pastors were ordered to go and teach all nations, baptizing them, &c. (Matt. xxviii. 20); and surely preaching and baptizing are not invisible operations.

Q. *What do we find—Isaiah ii. 2, v. 14—and in Psalm xviii. 4?*

A. "The mountain of the house of the Lord shall be prepared on the top of mountains." "You are the light of the world, a city seated on the top of a hill, that cannot be hid." "He hath put his tabernacle, his church, in the sun." Surely Protestants must shut their eyes to these texts, when they talk of an invisible Church.

Q. *What says Origen on this subject?*

A. "The Church is full of brightness from east to west." (Hom. iii. in S. Matt.)

Q. *What say Cyprian, Chrysostom, and Augustine?*

A. "The Church, clothed with the light of our Lord, spreads its beams over the whole world." (De Unit. Eccl.) "It is easier that the sun should be extinguished, than that the Church should be obscured." (Hom. iv. in Isaiah.) "The Church is seated on a mountain, and cannot be hid. They are blind, that see not so great a mountain; they shut their eyes against light. The Church hath this most certain mark, that she cannot be hid." (Lib. iii. Contra Paramen. et Contra Petil. c. 104.)

Q. *What think you now of an invisible Church?*

A. That it is the midsummer-night's dream of weak men, who struggle to sustain a bad cause,—a dream directly opposed to Scripture, to the Fathers, and to common sense.

Q. *Is this perpetual, visible succession of Popes, bishops, priests, and congregations, only to be found in the Catholic Church? May not Protestants say, that the succession of the first five pure centuries was their succession?*

A. They may as well talk of a white black-moor! Who ever heard of a Protestant Pope? The Church during these five ages, was always governed by Popes; Augustine gives their names and successional order. This is enough: the

early Church was not Protestant ; it had a Pope. Nor were its doctrines in any thing Protestant ; it believed, as we shall see afterwards, just what Catholics believe at present. Even Dudith, a Protestant, admits this : “ If that be true, which the Fathers have professed with *mutual consent*, it is altogether on the Papist’s side.” (Epist. 1 ad Bezam.)

Q. *What does Whitaker say ?* (Con. 4, q. 5, c. 3.)

A. “ In times past, no religion but the Papistical, had any place in the Church.”

Q. *May not Protestants say, that they have a visible succession, at least, from the Hussites, Vaudois, and other heretics of the 12th and 13th centuries ?*

A. That they have not, is evident from what we have stated of the doctrines of these heretics in chap. ii., p. 8. But even admitting this, in what way will they connect themselves with the Apostles ? they have still twelve hundred years of invisibility, or non-existence, to account for. Until they prove their visible existence, during all these long ages, none but a fool will believe that they are the Church of Christ.

Q. *Do not some say, the Catholic Church was the true Church till Luther’s time, but errors had crept in, which it was necessary to correct ?*

A. Yes ; but these supposed errors were either prejudicial to salvation, or they were not. If they were, then Christ has failed in his word,—then the gates of hell have prevailed against the Church, and this in the very teeth of Christ’s promises and security to the contrary ; but if these errors were not prejudicial to salvation, then they were only the errors of individuals, not the errors of the *Church teaching* ; and, accordingly, it was merely necessary to correct the individuals, but on every account to cling to the Church, as *the pillar and ground of truth* ; to act otherwise, was to be guilty of the dreadful crime of schism, so awfully denounced by St Paul.

Q. *May not these people say, that it was we who separated from them, not they from us ?*

A. No ; for when there are two bodies, one of which is great, the other small ; one ancient, the other modern ; one teaching the doctrine of a long series of ages, the other teaching a new creed, it is evidently not the great or the ancient, both in existence and doctrine, but the small and modern body, which becomes responsible for the separation : a small portion detached from a mountain, can never, with propriety, be called the mountain itself. It is the Free Kirk and the Puseyites who leave the Kirk of Scotland and the Church of England, not the reverse.

SECTION IV.

Q. *Are there any other marks of the true Church ?*

A. Yes ; four, enumerated in the Nicene Creed ; “ I believe in *One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.*”

Q. *Did Christ require unity in his Church ?*

A. He says, John x. 16, that there is but “ *ONE fold and ONE shepherd.*” St Paul, Rom. xii. 5, says : “ *We being many, are ONE BODY in Christ ;*” and Ephes. iv. that there is but “ *one body, one spirit, one Lord, one faith, one baptism.*” The Church, therefore, is one body, or fold, having one faith, under one shepherd.

Q. *What do you conclude from this ?*

A. That no Church can be the Church of Christ which has not this *oneness*, or unity.

Q. *Is the Protestant Church one ?*

A. On principle it cannot be one ; for its first principle—“ private interpretation”—has ever produced, and will ever produce, necessarily, schisms and divisions ; each one, learned or ignorant, interprets according to his peculiar light or interest.

Q. *Is the Protestant Church one in its government ?*

A. No ; it has for its head the King in Prussia, the Queen or State in England, and in Scotland the government is various, according to the whims of the various sects.

Q. *Is the Catholic Church one in her government ?*

A. Yes ; all the Catholics in the world are subject to their priests ; these priests are subject to their bishops ; and these bishops are appointed by, and subject to, Peter's lawful successor in the See of Rome.

Q. *Is the Protestant Church one in her faith ?*

A. She has one faith in England and another in Scotland, a third in Switzerland, and a fourth in Prussia. The Free Kirk holds, as damnable, what the Established Kirk believes to be good and true ; and the Puseyite believes what the English Church repudiates. In one Protestant Church, bishops, and ordination by bishops, are believed to be necessary ; in another, they are rejected. One Protestant body believes in the real presence ; and another, in a bare and empty memorial. All the minor Protestant sects are in the same melancholy predicament ; they differ from one another on some or many essential points.

Q. *Is the Catholic Church one in her faith ?*

A. All the Catholics in the world have one and the same creed. Amongst Catholics there are no sects,—no Church of Scotland, or England, or France ; all Catholics believe the

same truths, and to reject any one of these truths, is to cut one's self off from the Catholic communion. The Catholic Church is the Church, not of any nation, but of the world.

Q. Is the Protestant Church one in her moral doctrines?

A. No; one sect of Protestants believe in *predestination*, in salvation by *faith alone*; and another sect of Protestants holds the necessity of good works and free-will, whilst they denounce the above Calvinistic principles, as leading directly to the most debasing immorality.

Q. Is the Catholic Church one in her moral principles?

A. All Catholics follow the same moral principles; the same vices are denounced on the one hand, and the same virtues inculcated on the other.

Q. Is the Protestant discipline every where the same?

A. It is different in every country and every sect.

Q. Is the Catholic Church one on this head?

A. The Catholic Church is strictly uniform on every essential matter of discipline, whether that regard the pastors or the people: the same great feasts and fasts are every where observed.

Q. Is the Protestant Church one in her Liturgy, or public service?

A. No; on this she exhibits the most absurd contrariety: Scotland worships God in one way, England in another, Geneva in a third, Prussia in a fourth, Sweden in a fifth, and wherever a handful of Protestants can be assembled together, they strike out a service for themselves, according to their particular views.

Q. Is the Catholic Liturgy every where uniform?

A. The same great sacrifice of the Mass, and essentially in the same words, is every where offered; the same seven sacraments are every where administered in the same manner; even the forms of the public service are every where essentially the same.

Q. What inference do you draw from this?

A. That the Protestant Church is a *house divided against itself*,—that it is not *one*, but manifold; therefore, it is not the Church of Christ. That the Catholic Church is one strictly in every sense of the word; and, consequently, that as it is the only Church on earth which has perfect unity, it is unquestionably the one true Church of Christ.

Q. Are not Protestants one, because they all follow the Bible?

A. On the contrary, it is the Bible, abused by the principle of private interpretation, which occasions all their errors,

heresies, and schisms. The Prussian Mucker teaches his filthy principles from the Bible; the silly Mormon palms his nostrums on the Bible; the execrable Socialist proves his brutalities from the Bible; the Chartist extracts Chartism from the Bible; in a word, the Methodist, the Dancer, the Dipper, the Swaddler, the Free-Kirk-man, and every other sectarian, pervert God's Word, in order to make it support their jarring and contradictory systems, and they do this with as much assurance, as if God could teach that black is white, or that a thing may be black and white at the same time. Thus, amongst the Presbyterians, one sect teaches that patronage is damnable, whilst another teaches that it is a very good thing.

SECTION V.

Q. *What is the second mark of the true Church?*

A. Holiness, or sanctity.

Q. *Does it appear, from Scripture, that Christ's Church should be holy?*

A. The prophet Isaiah calls her, Isa. xxxv. 8, "*a way, which shall be called THE HOLY WAY, over which the unclean shall not pass.*" David, Ps. xcii. 5, says: "*Holiness becomes thy house, O Lord, for length of days.*" St Paul, Eph. v. 25, declares, that "*Christ loved the Church, and delivered himself for it, that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water and the word of life, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish.*" See also Tit. ii. 14, and 1 Peter ii. 9.

Q. *Is the Protestant Church holy in her pastors?*

A. No; to this she can have no pretension; her pastors are mere men of the world, not subjected to the restraints of Apostolic poverty, chastity, or mortification. The burden of their religious duty seems to be, the mere preaching of a sermon or two upon Sunday; whilst most of their time must be employed, not in Apostolic duties, but in looking after their own worldly interest, and that of their wives and children.

Q. *Is the Catholic Church holy in her pastors?*

A. They are all separated from the world and its gratifications, and dedicated entirely to promote God's glory, and the sanctification of souls; no worldly cares intrude upon them; the Church is their spouse, and the people their spiritual children; they are ever, in a variety of ways, employed in the spiritual improvement of their flock; they watch with tender care, from the cradle to the grave, those committed

to their charge; and, as they have no wives or families to provide for, their hearts are in their duties; and whatever of this world's goods they may possess, is employed for the glory of God.

Q. Are there any means of holiness in the Protestant Church?

A. No; they have destroyed them all; they have rejected the soul of religion, in rejecting the holy sacrifice of the Mass, and five of the sacraments,—all abundant sources of grace, as you shall afterwards see, where the subjects are treated. Even the two sacraments which they still retain, are, by them reduced to mere empty forms—the mere giving of a name, and the partaking of a little bread and wine.

Q. Has the Catholic Church means of holiness?

A. Yes; the most abundant, in the holy sacrifice of the Mass and the seven sacraments, which are all so many channels, through which the graces which flow from the wounds of our Redeemer, are conveyed to the souls of Catholics of every class, in every condition, and at every period of life, from the time they enter this world, until they render their souls into the hands of God.

Q. Is the Protestant Church holy in her doctrines?

A. The very contradictory nature of the various moral doctrines taught by the ever-varying sects of Protestants must, of itself, be ruinous to holiness. But what places the unholiness of her doctrines beyond all doubt, is her doctrine on predestination, on free-will, her belief that faith alone is necessary, and that good works are useless; for who, believing such absurdities as these, can have any motive to avoid vice, or practise virtue? Holiness is incompatible with these immoral principles.

Q. Is the Catholic Church holy in her doctrine?

A. She teaches her children to believe all that God has revealed, and to practise all that he has commanded; multitudes of Catholics, not content with observing the precepts, practise even the counsels of the Gospel. Fasting, mortification, unremitting prayer, self-denial, and a frequent participation of the sacraments, all of which are so pressingly recommended in the Scripture, are enjoined and practised by the whole Church, from the sovereign Pontiff, down to the humblest member of Christ's mystical body.

Q. Were there, in consequence of these holy means and holy doctrines, many members of the Catholic Church, illustrious for sanctity?

A. Yes; multitudes, and of every class, from the king to the mendicant, and from the Pope to the deacon.

Q. *Have even adversaries admitted this?*

A. Yes; the Apology for the Confession of Augsburg, Art. 13, declares, that St Bernard, St Francis, and St Bonaventure were saints; the Calendar of the Church of England admits others; and almost all our saints are admitted by the Puseyite section of the English Church.

Q. *In what Church did these admitted saints live and die?*

A. In the Catholic, Apostolic, and Roman Church.

Q. *What do you conclude from this?*

A. That as one can be sanctified through Christ in the Catholic Church, so he can certainly be saved in the same Church; and if he can be saved in this Church, it must be the true Church, and he can be saved in no other; for Christ did not establish two Churches. There is only *one baptism, one fold, one shepherd, one revelation, containing one true set of doctrines.*

Q. *Did God ever work miracles to testify the sanctity of a Catholic?*

A. Even enemies admit that he did. That he wrought miracles by the hand of St Francis Xavier, is allowed by Baldeus, Hackluit, and Tavernier, all rigid Lutherans and Calvinists. Now, St Francis was a Catholic Priest; and hence the Catholic religion, which, by the aid of these miracles, he taught and propagated, must be the true religion, since God could not give the testimony of his Almighty hand to error.

SECTION VI.

Q. *What is the third mark of the true Church?*

A. Catholicity, or universality.

Q. *Is this mark evidently required by Scripture?*

A. According to Scripture, the Catholic Church must be universal in three ways: universal as to *time*, universal as to *place*, and universal as to *doctrine*.

Q. *Where do you find that she must be universal as to time?*

A. In Isaiah lxii. 6: "Upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, I have appointed watchmen all the day and all the night, they shall NEVER hold their peace." Isa. ix. 7: "Of the increase of his government and peace there SHALL BE NO END." He shall sit upon the throne of David "to order it, and establish it,.....from henceforth EVEN FOR EVER." In John xiv. 16: "I will ask the Father, and he shall give you another Paraclete, that he may abide with you *for ever*."

Q. Where do you find universality, as to place, laid down in Scripture?

A. In Malachi i. 11: "*from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof, my name is great amongst the Gentiles.*" Ps. xxi. 28: "*All the ends of the earth shall remember, and shall be converted to the Lord.*" Ps. ii. 8: "*Ask of me, and I will give the Gentiles for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession.*" Luke xxiv. 46: "*That penance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations.*" Acts i. 8: "*And ye shall be witnesses to me in Jerusalem, and in all Judea and Samaria, and even to the uttermost parts of the earth.*"

Q. Is there any passage of Scripture, in which the above three kinds of universality are clearly laid down, as necessary qualities of the true Church?

A. Yes; in the commission given by Christ to his Apostles, Matth. xxviii. 19, 20: "*Going, therefore, teach ye all nations;.....teaching them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you; and, behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.*" Here you have, from the lips of Christ himself, an express attestation, that his Church *must* be Catholic, or universal, as to *time*, *place*, and *doctrine*.

Q. Is the Protestant Church universal in these three ways?

A. No; nor in any one of them. She is not universal as to time; for, a few centuries back, she had no existence; she is little more than three hundred years old. A Church is composed of pastors and people, teaching and believing certain doctrines; and no such body holding Protestant doctrines, were known in the world for fifteen hundred years after Christ left it. She is not universal either as to numbers or place; even the Greek Church is before her in numbers; and on this head she cannot bear a comparison with the Catholic Church. According to the *Scientific Miscellany*, the total number of Protestants in the world is 48,985,000; the total number of Greeks is 56,360,000; whilst the Catholics are 254,655,000; that is, the Catholics are nearly six to one. But if we take each Protestant Church by itself, and this is the true point of comparison (for these Protestant Churches all differ from one another), we will find, then, that Catholics are to Presbyterians as sixty-five to one, and to the Church of England, as thirty-six to one. Hence, it is not only incorrect, but ludicrous, to call any of these Protestant sects Catholic, or universal. Neither can they be called universal as to place; for Protestants are confined to a small corner of the

earth, as will be evident, by the following statistical account, from the above authority :

	<i>Europe.</i>	<i>Asia.</i>	<i>Africa.</i>	<i>America.</i>	<i>Oceanica.</i>
Catholics,.....	154,444,600	40,000,000	12,400,000	34,110,000	3,450,000
Protestants,...	39,675,000	50,000	10,000	9,150,000	50,000

These statistics are the most decisive proof, that the Protestant is not the Church of all nations ; she is not even the Church of any one nation, no, nor of even one parish, exclusively, on the face of the earth. In fine, she is not universal as to doctrine, either as to extent or truth ; for she has taught, and does teach, many evident errors, such as predestination, the rejection of free-will and good works, and the impossibility of keeping the commandments. And as to the teaching of all truth, she can have no pretension to it, since each Protestant sect has its *peculiar doctrines* ; scarcely two of them have the same creed. They even rejected, as apocryphal, at one time, whole books of the sacred Scripture, which they *now* admit : they reject to-day what they taught yesterday. Indeed, in point of doctrine, whether moral, dogmatical, or disciplinary, they present, only one confused and revolting mass of contradictions, contrarieties, and absurdities.

Q. Is the Catholic Church universal in the above three ways?

A. No one will dare to deny that she is the Church of *all ages*. She is the only Church upon earth that can be visibly traced back through every age, to the time of Christ. She is the Church of all nations, as is evident from the above statistical argument ; there is not a Christian, nay, scarcely a Pagan nation, that does not attest her actual presence, or, by noble monuments, her former greatness. Her ancient canon law is still, in a great measure, the law of Scotland ; her noble temples and colleges, dedicated to the living God, are still the pride of England ; the ruined monastic establishments and glorious cathedrals, that once adorned every valley of our country, have survived the Vandal hand of *barbarous reform*, as ever-enduring monuments, to perpetuate the history of Catholic greatness. Protestantism has never converted even *one* Pagan nation ; whilst every people that have been brought to the knowledge and worship of the true God, professing that they owe their conversion to the Catholic Church, loudly proclaim her universality ; *every where* her incense ascends ; *every where* her sacraments are administered ; *every where* her pure sacrifice is offered. To her alone did the Prophet speak, when he said : " I will give the nations for thine inheritance, and the ends of the earth for thy possession."

In fine, she is universal as to her doctrine; it is every where the *same*; it has, like the pure gold, passed through the ordeal of eighteen hundred years' examination, unchangeable and unchanged; the combined efforts of heresy and infidelity against it, have been unavailing. She teaches her children to observe *all* that God has commanded, and to believe *all* that He has revealed; her doctrine is, like her Divine Founder, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever.

Q. *What says St Augustine on the word Catholic?*

A. "The very name of *Catholic*," he says, "keeps me in the Church. Heretics have done their utmost to obtain that name, yet they have never been able to succeed. If a stranger, on entering any city, were to ask, Where is the Catholic Church? no heretic would dare to point out his heretical assembly." (Tom. vi. Contra Ep. Fund. chap. 4.)

Q. *Give us St Jerom's words, contra Lucif.*

A. "When you see anybody inherit their name from a particular man, as the Marcionites from Marcion, the Valentinians from Valentinus," (we may add the Lutherans from Luther, the Calvinists from Calvin), "you may look on that body, not as the Church of Christ, but as the school of Antichrist."

Q. *Give us a good reason why your name of Catholic, is the best proof that you are in the true Church.*

A. Those who remained in communion with the ancient body of the faithful, retained the ancient name, whilst innovators, gave to their followers, either their own name, or one derived from their peculiarly novel doctrine, or from the country in which this new creed made its first appearance. Thus, the Lutherans, the Calvinists, the Church of England, the Methodists, the Quakers, the Moravians, show, by their very names, the human origin of their religion.

Q. *What inference do you draw from all that you have said on this mark of Catholicity?*

A. That the Scripture expressly requires, in the true Church, universality as to *time, place, and doctrine*; that the Protestant Church is not universal in any of these three ways; that the Catholic Church is the only Church upon earth that has this triple universality; and, consequently, that it is the true Church of Christ.

SECTION VII.

Q. *What is the fourth mark of the true Church?*

A. Apostolicity.

Q. *What do you mean by this word?*

A. That any Church, pretending to be the Church of

Christ, must be able to trace her *doctrine*, her *orders*, and her *mission*, to the Apostles of Christ.

Q. Why should this be the case?

A. Because, during all the time the Church has existed, there must have been true pastors "for the work of the ministry, for the edification of the body of Christ,"—Ephes. iv. "Upon thy walls, O Jerusalem, I have appointed watchmen.....they shall *never* hold their peace,"—Is. lxii. 6. These pastors must have been lawfully sent; for "no man taketh the honour of the priesthood upon himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was,"—Heb. v. 4. Thus, Christ sent the Apostles; these Apostles sent others,—for example, Paul and Barnabas; and again, Paul sent Timothy and Titus; and, in this manner, each succeeding generation of pastors was sent by the preceding, from Christ to the present time; and the generation of pastors giving their commission to their successors, did it, by the power of Christ originally given, in these words: "As my Father hath sent me, I also send you." In fine, the pastors of every age must have been ordained, according to that of St Paul to Titus,—i. 5: "For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and shouldst *ordain* priests in every city, as I also appointed thee."

Q. May it not be said that the Protestant Church is Apostolic in her doctrine, seeing that she adopts the Scripture as her rule?

A. If she were, all Protestants would teach the same truths; and surely no man in his senses will assert, that either the Apostles or the Scripture could teach all the mongrel, contradictory, and absurd creeds of Protestantism. Besides, for fourteen hundred years after the last of the Apostles left this world, Protestant doctrines were unknown amongst mankind.

Q. Is the Catholic Church Apostolic in her doctrine?

A. Even our adversaries admit this, in spite of themselves; or whilst they unwittingly admit, that we were the first Church, they as uniformly maintain that Popery is *unchangeable*. We teach the same doctrine now which was taught in every century and country since the time of Christ; our doctrines cannot be traced to any man or set of men, to any particular country or date, posterior to the time of the Apostles; we defy our adversaries to trace it to any but Apostolic authority. Besides, we are the only Church that has existed in *every* age, since the Apostolic times.

Q. Is not the Protestant Church Apostolic as to mission?

A. Certainly not; Luther was the first Protestant minister the world ever saw. By whom was he sent? Not by God; for he never wrought *one* miracle to prove it, and his life was such as to prove that he was sent by an *opposite authority*. Not by the Apostles; for he came fifteen hundred years too late to have any connection with them. Not by the Catholic Church; for she cut him off from her communion, and she could not give a commission to teach error, directly opposed to her own creed. No Protestant Church existed prior to Luther's time, from which he could receive a commission; therefore he had no mission; therefore all his followers, in the heretical and schismatical body to which he gave being, are missionless intruders, who pay no regard to the words of St Paul: "How shall they preach unless they be sent?"—Rom. x. Of such as they, the Almighty says, Jer. xlii. 21: "I have not *sent* these prophets, yet they ran; I have not spoken to them, yet they prophesied." It is incumbent upon *them* to show that they are not the thieves and robbers mentioned by St John, chap. x.

Q. *Is the Catholic Church Apostolic as to mission?*

A. The Catholic Church, alone, has, beyond all doubt, existed in every age, from the present, till the Apostolic age. Hence, her pastors are the only pastors on earth, who can trace their mission from priest to bishop, and from bishop to Pope, back through every century, until they trace that mission to the Apostles, who were commissioned by Christ himself. We have a complete list of an uninterrupted chain of Roman Pontiffs, reaching from the present Pontiff, Pius IX. to St Peter. We have lists of all the Catholic sees in the world, and the names of the bishops who, in every age, occupied them; so that we have an unbroken succession of bishops ruling, teaching, and adorning every age and clime, all these in strict communion with the chief see, that of Rome.

Q. *Is the Protestant Church Apostolic as to orders?*

A. The fact is, they have no orders at all, nor do many of them even pretend to have orders. The ministers of the various Calvinistic sects, as well as those of all other reformed sects not Lutheran, are mere laymen. The Lutherans, generally, can have no orders; because they have never had a regular succession of *validly* ordained or consecrated bishops from whom they could receive orders. As to the orders of the Church of England, they are, to say the least, extremely doubtful; because, it has never been proved, that the *first* Protestant bishop of the Church of England was himself

validly ordained or consecrated, and because, the true form of ordination was not in use in the Church of England during one hundred and twelve years. But granting that they really are validly ordained, they have no *mission*, and hence they can be reputed only as so many suspended, schismatical, and heretical priests. In fine, as the whole fabric of Protestantism is only three hundred and thirty-six years old, it is manifest, that her ministers cannot trace their orders to the Apostolic times.

Q. Are the orders of the Catholic priesthood Apostolic?

A. They can be traced from priest to bishop, and from bishop to Pope, through every century, back to the time of the Apostles. Indeed, a perpetual succession of Catholic pastors has always existed; and hence, so little doubt is there, even amongst Protestants on this subject, that the Church of England, by claiming her orders from us, clearly and unequivocally admits the Apostolicity of the orders of the Catholic Church.

Q. What inference do you draw from all this?

A. That the Protestant Church is not, and the Catholic Church is, the true Church of Christ.

Q. Why this conclusion?

A. According to Scripture, the true Church must derive, by a perpetual and uninterrupted succession from the Apostles, her *doctrines*, her *mission*, and her *orders*; but the Protestant Church is not Apostolical in any of these ways; therefore she cannot be the true Church. The Catholic Church, on the contrary, is evidently Apostolical in her doctrine, her orders, and her mission; therefore she is the true Church of Christ.

Q. What general inference do you draw from all we have said on the marks of the Church?

A. That the Protestant Church has not even one of these scriptural marks of truth; hence, her claim to be the Church of Christ is ludicrous in the extreme; that, on the other hand, as we have seen, the Catholic Church evidently possesses them all; therefore she is the *one, holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church*.

Q. Can you give one other proof that the Catholic is the true Church?

A. Were we destitute of every other argument, the following would be sufficient. That Church, and that Church only, can be the true Church of Christ, which openly avows and believes its own infallibility; for, having once admitted that Christ's Church is infallible, any Church teaching its own

fallibility, teaches that it cannot be the Church of Christ; because, even though such Church were actually in itself infallible, by teaching its fallibility, it teaches an error in dogma, and, by this very fact, becomes fallible. But the Catholic Church is the ONLY Church upon earth, which avows, believes, and teaches its own infallibility; therefore, the Catholic Church is, beyond all doubt, the true, infallible Church of Christ; and the Protestant Church, by proclaiming her own fallibility and liability to err, proves to a demonstration, that she has no right to the august title of Christ's Church.

Q. What do you conclude from all you have said?

A. We can come to only one conclusion on this all-important subject, which we think fully warranted by what we have seen. That conclusion is this: the true Church of Christ, which is infallible, ought, according to Scripture, to be ONE, HOLY, CATHOLIC, and APOSTOLICAL. But the Protestant Church is neither one, nor holy, nor Catholic, nor Apostolical; therefore she is not—she cannot be—the true, infallible Church of Christ. On the contrary, the Church called Catholic is strictly *One* in her faith, her government, her liturgy; *Holy* in her head, her doctrines, and her saints; *Catholic* as to time, place, and doctrine; *Apostolical* as to her society, doctrine, orders, and mission. Therefore, either she is the true, infallible Church of Christ, or God is a deceiver, the Scripture is not his Word, reason is fancy, and religion, a solemn mockery.

CHAPTER VIII.

ON THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH.

SECTION I.

Q. Who is the chief head of the Church?

A. Jesus Christ is the true Head of the Church, who, being himself invisible, governs his Church from heaven in an invisible manner.

Q. Did Jesus Christ appoint any vicar on earth to govern his Church, in quality of visible chief or head?

A. Yes; he appointed for that purpose St Peter and his successors.

Q. Did St Peter receive more power than the other Apostles from Christ?

A. Yes; as is evident from many passages of Scripture.

Q. Quote St Matth. xvi.

A. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Q. What is meant here by the word "rock?"

A. Peter himself.

Q. Why?

A. Because, in John i. 42, Christ, in calling Peter, gives him a new name, which signifies a rock, and which explains clearly the meaning of the word "rock" in the above text. "Thou art Simon the son of Jona, thou shalt be called *Cephas*, which is interpreted Peter, or a rock." Our Saviour spoke in the Syriac language, and in that language, *Cephas* is the same as *Petros* in the Greek, both meaning a rock; indeed, the words of Christ, literally interpreted, have this meaning: "*Thou art a rock, and upon this rock I will build my Church.*" Such words were not addressed to any other Apostle.

Q. What are the words of the text immediately following? (Matt. xvi. 19.)

A. "And I will give to thee" (Peter) "the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

Q. Did not Christ address the same words to all the Apostles?

A. On this occasion, he addressed these words to *Peter alone*, which makes it quite evident that he intended to confer on Peter a peculiar power; when he addressed the other Apostles in these words, he did so *generally* and to all *in common*.

Q. What does Christ say to Peter—John xxi. 15, 16, 17?

A. "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." And the Fathers of the Church have understood by the lambs, the lay faithful people; and by the sheep, the pastors of the people; for as the sheep nourish the lambs, so do the pastors of the Church tend, and spiritually feed, their flocks.

Q. What do you conclude from the above commission given only to Peter?

A. That Christ gave the charge of the whole Church, pastors and people, sheep and lambs, to Peter alone.

Q. Have you any other proofs of St Peter's primacy, or supremacy?

A. Yes; in Luke xxii. 26, Christ says to his Apostles: "He that is greater among you, let him become as the younger; and he that is the leader, as he that serveth." Therefore there was a GREATER, or LEADER, amongst the Apostles, otherwise Christ's words could have no meaning; but if there was a leader, Peter, and no other, was that man.

Q. Does Christ any where offer up a special prayer for Peter's faith, without including, in this prayer, the rest of the Apostles?

A. Yes; Luke xxii. 32,—Christ says to Peter, "But I have prayed for thee, that thy FAITH FAIL NOT; and thou, being once converted, CONFIRM THY BRETHREN." From which it is clear, that Peter had a superiority over his brethren, given to him by Christ; for if he was only their equal, how could he confirm them?

Q. Why does Christ, John xxi. 15, before giving Peter the special charge of all Christ's lambs and sheep, ask that Apostle whether he loves him (Christ) MORE than the other Apostles love him?

A. Christ evidently requires greater love from Peter, because he is to confer a greater dignity upon him, committing to his care the whole Christian community, pastors and people.

Q. Have you any other scriptural proof of Peter's superiority?

A. When the Scripture gives the names of the Apostles in order, Peter's name is always placed first. (Matt. x.) Nor can it be alleged that this was done, because Peter was the oldest, for Andrew was Peter's elder, and was even the first to follow Christ. St Ambrose, in Epist. ii. ad Cor. xii., says: "Not Andrew, but Peter was chief amongst the Apostles." St Augus., lib. de Baptist., says: "Behold Peter, who held the preëminence with such lustre." St Optat., lib. contra Parmen., adds: "Peter was appointed chief of the Apostles, to the end that unity might be preserved in the Church."

Q. Did Peter act at any time as chief functionary of the Church?

A. He did so immediately after the Ascension of our Lord. He assembled the Apostles; he presided at the election of an Apostle to replace Judas. (Acts i.) Peter was the first to preach Jesus Christ crucified; and, by the conversion of three thousand at his first sermon, first gave form to the Christian Church, verifying the words of Christ, that he should be the rock, or foundation, from which the Church should rise. (Acts ii.) He is the first to teach the admission of the Pagans or heathens to baptism, which matter, he alone was taught, by a revelation from heaven. (Acts x.) He works the first miracles, at the beautiful gate of the Temple, on the lame man (Acts iii.); on Æneas and Tabitha (Acts ix.); and, as a punishment, on Ananias and Sapphira. (Acts v.)

Q. Does it appear, from any other circumstances, that Peter was chief amongst the Apostles?

A. Yes ; for when he was cast into prison the *whole* Church prayed for him, nor was this done for any of the other Apostles ; to him alone, did heaven vouchsafe an angel as a deliverer from his prison. (Acts xii.)

Q. *Did Peter act as presiding teacher amongst the Apostles ?*

A. Yes ; he decided, in the first Council held at Jerusalem by the Apostles, that the Christians should not be subjected to the Jewish rite of circumcision ; St Paul, though an Apostle, did not venture to decide upon it. "Men, brethren," said Peter, "you know that in former days *God made CHOICE among us*, that by *my mouth* the Gentiles should hear the word of the Gospel ;" and, when Peter had made an end of speaking, "*all the multitude held their peace*;" and even James himself, who was bishop of Jerusalem, where the Apostles were assembled, rose only to repeat St Peter's decision, and to acquiesce in it. (Acts xv.)

Q. *What do you conclude from all this ?*

A. That there is not one truth more clearly established in Scripture, than the superiority, or supremacy, of Peter, and that the acrimonious attacks of Protestants on this article of the Christian faith, only prove, that they make a sport of the Scripture, except in so far as it supplies them with some passages, seeming to bear two meanings, which they pervert, in order to prop up the tottering fabrics of contradictory and contrary schisms.

SECTION II.

Q. *The supremacy of St Peter once established, what necessarily follows ?*

A. That all the *successors* of St Peter hold the same *rank* and *power* ; because the form of government, established by Christ in his Church, was not to last merely during one or two centuries, but *always*, like the Church, *until the consummation of the world*.

Q. *Who are the successors of St Peter ?*

A. The bishops of Rome, in which capital of the world St Peter established his See, and ended his life.

Q. *What reply do you make to those who pretend to hold that St Peter never was at Rome ?*

A. We put the following rather troublesome questions to them. In the first place, tell us, if St Peter did not suffer martyrdom at Rome, under the Emperor Nero, in what part of the world, and when, did he die ? Secondly, if St Peter did not die at Rome, at what time, and from what country, were his relics or remains transported thither, for there they are, beyond all doubt ? Thirdly, did not the Fathers of the

early and pure Church, who lived near to the time of St Peter, know better than Protestants, who made their first appearance only three hundred years ago, who was the first bishop of Rome?

Q. *Do any of these Fathers say St Peter was the first?*

A. Yes; St Augustine, Ep. ad Gener., enumerating the bishops who had governed the Church of Rome, begins thus: Peter was the first, to Peter succeeded Linus, and to Linus Clement. St Optatus, contra Parmen: "St Peter *first* occupied the See of Rome, to him Linus succeeded, and after Linus, Clement." St Ireneus, lib. iii. cap. 3; St Epiphanius de 27 Heres.; and all the other Fathers who have given a catalogue of the bishops of Rome, assign the first occupation of that See to Peter. St Leo, Ser. de Petro et Paulo, says: "Rome became the capital of the Christian world, because St Peter established his See in Rome." In Pream. Concil. Chalco. and also in Concil. Ephes., it is said, that "Peter lives, judges, and defines, in his *successors*." "Happy Church," says Tertullian, addressing the Roman Church, "which the *Great Apostles* fully impregnated with all their doctrine and all their *blood*."

Q. *Do all the faithful owe obedience to the bishop of Rome?*

A. Yes; all are bound to obey him as the vicar of Jesus Christ, the chief bishop of the whole Christian Church.

Q. *Is it a grievous sin to refuse submission to the sovereign Pontiff?*

A. "Whoever opposes," says St Paul, "the lawful authorities, oppose the order of the Almighty; and those who resist such authorities, bring condemnation on themselves."

Q. *Is it necessary that all Christian Churches, be in strict communion with the See of Rome?*

A. So all the Fathers teach. St Ireneus, lib. iii. cap. 3, says: "The Roman Church is the principal, and hence all other Churches must be united to her." St Cyprian, lib. i. epist. 8: "There is only one God, one Christ, one Church, *one chair of Peter*, established by the Word of Christ himself." St Jerom, Epist. to Pope Damasus, says, "I am attached to your chair, which is that of St Peter; I know that the Church is built upon that rock;" and again: "Whoever eats not the Lamb in that house, is profane; whoever takes not refuge in that ark, shall perish in the waters of the deluge; whoever is not with *you*, is against *Jesus Christ*; whoever gathereth not with *you*, scattereth abroad."

Q. *Why is the Catholic Church called also Roman?*

A. Because the Catholic Churches of all nations and ages

have honoured the See of Rome; and, on account of its "superior headship," have always gloried in the profession of their attachment to it, as the source of their jurisdiction, and the guardian of the sacred deposit of their common faith.

SECTION III.

Q. *Has the assertion "that the Pope is Antichrist," any foundation in Scripture?*

A. That the Antichrist will come before the end of the world, the Scripture abundantly proves; but that the Pope is that Antichrist, is not only unscriptural, but antiscritptural.

Q. *Where in Scripture do you find the insolent assertion refuted?*

A. In very many places. In Matth. xxiv., wars, famines, earthquakes, pestilence, false prophets, tribulation, *such as hath never been nor shall be*, all this shall exist, before the *abomination of desolation* (the Antichrist) shall be seen standing in the holy place; therefore, as these extraordinary scourges have not yet made their appearance, Antichrist has not yet come. In the same place, it is said, *the Gospel shall be preached in the whole world*, before the Antichrist and the consummation come. But the Gospel has not yet been preached in the whole world; therefore, the Antichrist has not yet come; therefore the Popes, who have existed even since the time of Christ, cannot be the Antichrist.

Q. *Have you any other texts?*

A. Yes; texts in abundance. Daniel vii. connects the *abomination of desolation*, or the Antichrist, with the *placing of thrones* and the *sitting in judgment of the Ancient of days*. He gives power to the beast, for a *time, times, and half a time*, or three years and a-half, which exactly agrees with the period of his career fixed in the Apocalypse (chap. xi.) forty-two months, or twelve hundred and sixty days. Therefore, Antichrist's reign is to be only three and a-half years, and these immediately before the last judgment. But the Popes have reigned since the time of Christ; therefore the Popes cannot be the Antichrist.

Q. *What does the Apocalypse say, chap. xi.?*

A. That, during the above reign of Antichrist, during twelve hundred and sixty days, Henech and Elias will preach against him. But Henech and Elias have not yet come; therefore, neither has Antichrist yet appeared.

Q. *What says the 13th chap. of same book?*

A. That Antichrist will mark on the *right hand* or *fore-head* all his followers; but the Pope has not done so; therefore he is not Antichrist. Again, no man is to be allowed

to buy or sell, but he that hath the character, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name; but Catholics have neither his character, nor name, nor number, nor has the Pope prevented them from buying or selling: therefore, again, the Pope is not Antichrist.

Q. What do you find in Apoc. xiii. ?

A. That Antichrist is to open his mouth in blasphemies against God, to blaspheme his name and his tabernacle, and them that dwell in heaven. But the Pope has made God's holy name honoured and adored in every clime and at all times; through him was the world converted to Christ; it was he who converted all that are now Protestants from Paganism; the Pope honours and venerates them that dwell in heaven,—'tis Protestants who dishonour and blaspheme the angels and saints, *them that dwell in heaven*; therefore the Pope, at least, is not Antichrist. The above text would go far to prove, that Antichrist is, or will be, a Protestant.

Q. What remark do you make on Apoc. xvii. 7 ?

A. It says: "The *beast* which thou sawest *was*, and *is not*. and shall come up out of the bottomless pit." But these words cannot be verified in any Pope; therefore, the Pope is not Antichrist.

Q. Is it clear from Scripture that Rome will be the seat of Antichrist ?

A. No; it is much more evident that Jerusalem will be his seat. In the Gospel of St Matth., chap. xxiv., Christ speaks first of the *temple of Jerusalem*, and immediately after, connects this with the *abomination of desolation* to be seen standing in the *holy place*; evidently pointing out that *temple* as the *holy place* where the beast should be enthroned; and this is clearly confirmed by the Apoc. chap. xi. 8, where, speaking of the wars to be carried on by Antichrist, and of those that were to be slain by him, St John says: "And their bodies shall lie in the streets of the *great city*, which is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, *WHERE THEIR LORD ALSO WAS CRUCIFIED.*" Now, the Lord was crucified in Jerusalem, not in Rome; therefore Jerusalem, not Rome, will be the seat of Antichrist. See also, on this subject, Apoc. xi. xii. xiii. xvii.

CHAPTER IX.

ON THE COUNCILS.

SECTION I.

Q. *How many kinds of Councils are there?*

A. Two kinds; general and particular Councils.

Q. *What is a general or œcumenical Council?*

A. An assembly of bishops, to which all the bishops of the world are invited or summoned, presided over by the Pope or his legates, or at least confirmed and approved by him.

Q. *What is a particular, national, or provincial Council?*

A. An assembly of bishops, to which are invited all the bishops of a nation or province.

Q. *Can a Council err in its decision on any matter of faith?*

A. General or œcumenical Councils are infallible in matters of faith, not so particular Councils.

Q. *Why do you say that a general Council is infallible?*

A. Because, if a general Council erred, in a matter of faith, the whole Church would be in error; now, this cannot be, because the gates of hell shall never prevail against the Church.

Q. *Why do you say the whole Church would err, if a general Council taught error?*

A. Because the bishops assembled in a general Council represent the whole Church; and any error taught by them, is, consequently, an error of the whole Church.

Q. *In what light, then, are we to look on the decision of a general Council?*

A. As the decision of the Holy Ghost.

Q. *How does St Peter speak at the first general Council?* (Acts xv. 28.)

A. "It hath," he says, "*seemed good to the HOLY GHOST and to us, to lay no farther burden upon you.*"

Q. *Is it a great sin to refuse submission to a general Council?*

A. It is the greatest act of criminal pride and presumption, accompanied by the awful guilt of heresy or schism, or both. We call it extremely criminal, as well as irrational; because the man who will not submit, prefers his own one opinion—and this in a matter regarding which he is neither qualified nor authorized to judge—to the deliberately formed decision

of an immense assemblage of the best qualified, and most competently authorized, legitimate judges.

Q. May it not be said, that we are obliged to abide by the decisions of a general Council, only when these are in accordance with the Word of God?

A. This is a mere piece of sophistry; it supposes that the Church may teach what is opposed to God's Word. Now, this is impossible; for in that case, God must have failed in his word; his Holy Spirit, as he promised, would not have taught his Church all truth for ever; the gates of hell would have prevailed against her. God did not tell the world to be guided by what *they thought* conformable to the Scripture; He sent his pastors to *teach all nations*, and told the nations, that he who would not believe these, should be condemned.

SECTION II.

Q. How many general Councils have been held?

A. Besides that held by the Apostles and first Pastors of the Church, eighteen others have been held.

Q. Where and when were the four first general Councils held?

A. The first at Nice in 325, the second at Constantinople in 381, the third at Ephesus in 431, the fourth at Chalcedon in 451.

Q. Where and when were the other general Councils held?

A. Three in the years 553, 680, 869, in Constantinople; four, in the years 1123, 1139, 1179, 1215, in Rome; one, in 787, in Nice; two, in 1245, 1274, in Lyons. A general Council was held at Vienne in 1311; one at Florence in 1439; one at Constance in 1414.

Q. What was the last general Council?

A. The Council of Trent.

Q. Why do you place that of Trent amongst the general Councils?

A. Because all the bishops of the Christian world were invited to it; the Pope, by his legates, presided over it, and confirmed its decisions.

Q. How many ecclesiastical dignitaries attended it?

A. There were six cardinals, three patriarchs, thirty-two archbishops, and two hundred and twenty-eight bishops.

Q. Were the Lutheran and Calvinist ministers invited to assist at it?

A. Yes; they were entreated to attend, and every safe-conduct they could desire offered them: it was their own fault that they were not present.

Q. Are Protestants bound to obey the decisions of this Council of Trent?

A. Certainly; because these decisions emanated from the lawfully-constituted judges of the true Church of Christ.

Q. Who are the lawful judges of Christian doctrine?

A. Only the bishops of the true Church, who have been appointed by Christ for that purpose.

Q. Repeat the words of St Paul to the ancients, or bishops, of the Church. (Acts xx. 28.)

A. "Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops to **RULE** the Church of God."

Q. What remarks do you make on this passage?

A. The bishops are, under the guidance of the Holy Ghost, to rule, or govern, the Church; this they could not do, unless they were qualified to distinguish, with the utmost certainty, good from bad doctrine.

Q. Can a general Council frame new matters or articles of faith?

A. No; a general Council can only explain what has been already revealed; it belongs to God alone to reveal new articles of faith.

Q. What if a general Council, or Papal Consistory, should undertake to depose a king, or absolve his subjects from their obedience?

A. No Catholic is bound to submit to such a decree. Indeed, every Catholic may renounce, upon oath, any such doctrine, and this without the least breach of Catholic principle.

Q. Must not Catholics believe the Pope in himself to be infallible?

A. This is a Protestant invention; it is no article of the Catholic faith; no decision of his can oblige, under pain of heresy, unless it be received and enforced by the teaching body; that is, by the bishops of the Church.

Q. Can the Pope absolve subjects from their allegiance on account of the heresy or schism of their king?

A. No; such dispensation or absolution is null; Catholics are still at liberty to defend their king and country at the hazard of their lives, even against the Pope himself.

Q. Can Catholics lawfully kill their prince or king, if he be excommunicated for heresy or schism?

A. Such an act is declared, by the Catholic General Council of Constance, damnable and heretical, as well as contrary to the known laws of God and nature.

Q. Can the Pope, or any power in the Church, license men to lie, or forswear themselves; to injure their neighbours, or destroy their country, under pretence of promoting the Catholic cause?

A. Such licence can have no other effect, than to add sacrilege and blasphemy to the commission of the above crimes.

Q. Are equivocation or mental reservation allowed by the Catholic Church?

A. No; these are Protestant charges, invented for the purpose of exhibiting Catholics in odious colours. The Catholic Church never taught such unworthy doctrines; on the contrary, she disapproves and condemns them.

CHAPTER X.

ON HERESY.

SECTION I.

Q. What is heresy?

A. An obstinate attachment to one's own private opinion, in opposition to what is declared an article of faith; and he is guilty of it, who prefers his own opinion, to the declared doctrine of the universal Church; for example, if he hold obstinately, any meaning he chooses to give to any portion of Scripture, which meaning is opposed to that given by the Church.

Q. Have all heretics pretended to prove their peculiar doctrines from Scripture?

A. All, without exception. The Arians denied the substantiality of the Word, depending on that passage of St John xiv.: "*My Father is greater than I.*" The Macedonians denied the divinity of the Holy Spirit, on these words, Rom. viii. 26: "*The Spirit himself asketh for us with unspeakable groanings.*" The Manicheans pretended to prove, that Christ became man *only in appearance*, by Philip. ii. 7: "*Taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men.*" The Nestorians fancied they proved, that in Christ there were two persons, by Coloss. ii. 9: "*For in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead* **CORPORALLY.**" The Eutychians cited John i., "*And the Word was made flesh,*" to prove that Christ had only one nature; and the Pelagians founded their denial of original sin, on Ezech. xviii. 20: "*The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father.*"

Q. What was the source of all these errors?

A. The presumptuous desire and determination, of each heresiarch, to prefer his own interpretation of the Scripture, to that given by the whole Church.

Q. *Were Luther and Calvin guilty of a similar irrational presumption?*

A. They were shipwrecked on the same rock, which had caused the ruin of all the heresiarchs that had gone before them. Calvin, for example, gave these words, "*This is my body*," a figurative meaning; whilst the whole Church then existing, and the whole Christian world during fifteen hundred years, understood them in their natural sense. Luther explained these words, Rom. iii., "*Man is justified by faith without the works of the law*," as dispensing with the necessity of good works, and the observing of God's commandments; whilst the whole Church understood these words to mean, that man is justified neither by the works of the natural nor of the Jewish law, but by faith in Jesus Christ, and by the works which proceed from that faith, having the grace of God for their source.

Q. *Did Luther and Calvin act uniformly, on this irrational principle of preferring, each his own individual judgment to that of the whole Church?*

A. Yes; such was the principle upon which they grounded each article of their new faith.

Q. *Can Luther, or any of his followers, be excusable before God, seeing that each one of them prefers, in the interpretation of Scripture, his own ONE light, and his own ONE judgment, to the light and judgment of the whole Church?*

A. Certainly not; for to such individual we say: Either you believe that you are *fallible* in the interpretation which you give the Scripture, or you hold that you are *infallible*; if you say you are fallible, then your faith is uncertain and vacillating, and, consequently, is not faith at all; but if you say you are infallible, then your absurd presumption drives you to assert, that the *whole Church* may err in her interpretation of Scripture, but that you *individually*, can interpret it with *infallible* certainty!!

Q. *What can he reply to this dilemma?*

A. We defy him to make any satisfactory reply. He is either the victim of perplexity, or the dupe of the most insupportable obstinacy.

SECTION II.

Q. *Have you observed any peculiarities, which have uniformly accompanied every important heresy, that has made its appearance in the Christian world?*

A. Yes ; five peculiarities are always observable. 1st, Every heresiarch presumed to blame the Church with having fallen into pernicious error ; 2dly, These heresiarchs, with their adherents, always separated themselves from the Church ; 3dly, They uniformly taught *new doctrines*, unknown till then in the Christian world ; 4thly, They always gave their own name, or the name of their country, or the name of their new dogmas, to their followers ; 5thly, Not one of them could ever prove that he had a lawful mission.

Q. *Have you observed the same traits in the heresiarchs Luther and Calvin ?*

A. Yes ; like Arius, Macedonius, Nestorius, and Eutyches, they blamed the Church,—they separated themselves from her,—they taught *new doctrines*,—they gave their names to their followers,—and they were unable to prove a lawful mission.

Q. *How do you prove that Luther, for example, taught new dogmas ?*

A. We defy him or any of his followers, to name one country, one parish, or even one village, which, from the time of Christ until Luther appeared, ever taught, that there are only two sacraments ; that the Mass is an abomination ; the invocation of Saints, idolatry ; Purgatory, a superstition ; and the Pope, Antichrist.

Q. *Have you remarked any other peculiarity as often as any new doctrine appeared in the Church ?*

A. We can always name the author of such new creed,—tell the place and time, where it made its first appearance,—give the names of the first men who opposed it,—and point out the Council which condemned it. Thus, we know that ARIUS, in the YEAR 315, in ALEXANDRIA, a city of Egypt, was the first to teach, that Christ Jesus was not equal to the Father ; and we know, that this error was combated by the PATRIARCH ALEXANDER and by ST ATHANASIUS, and that it was CONDEMNED BY THE FIRST COUNCIL OF NICE.

Q. *Do we observe the same peculiarities, as to the new doctrine of Luther ?*

A. Exactly the same. That doctrine made its first appearance at WITTEMBERG, in Saxony, in the YEAR 1517 ; it had LUTHER for its author ; was COMBATED BY ALL THE UNIVERSITIES to which he appealed ; and was finally CONDEMNED BY THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

Q. *What other marks of novelty do you discover in Luther's doctrine ?*

A. Three other marks. That doctrine was at first em-

braced by *very few* ; all those who embraced it, had been previously taught a *very different doctrine* ; and its appearance gave rise to great confusion, amazement, and sedition.

Q. May it not be said, that Luther taught nothing new, but merely reëstablished what the Apostles taught ?

A. This reply is justly suspected, because it was the reply of every heresiarch that appeared in the world.

Q. How do you refute this assertion ?

A. The doctrine of the Apostles could never cease to be taught, because Christ declared *he would be with his Apostles teaching ALL DAYS even to the consummation of the world* ; but the doctrine of Luther was not only not taught, it was not even known, before his own time ; therefore, the doctrine of Luther was not the doctrine of the Apostles.

Q. Were Luther and Calvin better able to prove their mission than were Arius, Macedonius, or Nestorius ?

A. No ; in this they had the very same difficulty to contend with, as had these heresiarchs.

Q. How did the Catholics prove to the reforming leaders that they had no mission ?

A. They said to them : Your ecclesiastical superiors have not sent you to preach or baptize ; therefore you have no ordinary mission ; but neither have you an extraordinary mission ; for, if you were sent immediately and directly by God himself, you would have been able to prove this, like Moses or our Saviour, by working miracles.

Q. Did Luther himself admit, that no man could preach unless he had one or other of these missions ?

A. Yes ; addressing the Anabaptist preachers, he says : " If you are sent by man, show us your patent ; if by God, let us see you working miracles." (German Edit. T. 5, p. 491-6.) He forgot, however, this embarrassing dilemma, when the Catholics, with much more justice, applied it to himself.

Q. Could not Luther, who was a priest of the Catholic Church, reply, that he had power and commission from her to preach the true doctrine contained in the Scripture ?

A. Either the Catholic Church was at that time the true Church, or she had ceased to be such ; if she was then the true Church, it was unlawful for Luther to separate from her, and she could not give him a commission to preach a doctrine contrary to her own ; but if she had ceased to be the true Church, then she was not qualified, to give any commission at all.

Q. As then Luther and Calvin had evidently no mission,

either ordinary or extraordinary, in what light are we to regard them and their successors in the ministry?

A. As wolves in sheeps' clothing, who have entered the fold, not by the door, but over the wall; of whom Christ says, that they come not to feed, but to devour the sheep.

CHAPTER XI.

ON THE OBEDIENCE DUE TO THE CHURCH.

SECTION I.

Q. *Are we obliged to obey the Church?*

A. Yes; because our Saviour says, Matth. xviii. 17: "If he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican."

Q. *What does Christ say to the pastors of the Church?* (Luke x. 16.)

A. "He that heareth you, heareth me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me."

Q. *What says St Paul?* (Heb. xiii. 17.)

A. "Obey your prelates, and be subject to them; for they watch, as being to render an account for your souls."

Q. *Are we bound, in conscience, to obey the ecclesiastical, as well as the civil powers?*

A. Yes; because both are instituted by the appointment of God. Rom. xiii. 1: "Let every soul be subject to *higher powers*; for there is *no power* but from God; and those that are, are ordained of God: therefore, he that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that resist, purchase to themselves damnation.... Wherefore be subject of necessity, not only for wrath, but also for *conscience's sake*."

Q. *What follows from these passages?*

A. That we are obliged to obey the civil authorities, and to observe the commandments of the Church.

Q. *But are not the commandments of the Church, the mere commandments of men?*

A. True; but we are obliged to keep the commandments of men, when God ordains it; for example, the command of a father, or a magistrate, is only the commandment of man; yet we are bound to observe both, because God so ordains; thus also are we bound to obey the Church, because it is the

Q. Does not Christ say, Matth. xv. 9: "In vain do they worship me, teaching doctrines and commandments of men?"

A. Yes; but Christ speaks here, of vain and useless human commandments, not in accordance with, but opposed to his law.

Q. To what purpose are the commandments of the Church?

A. They serve to lead us to the better observance of the commandments of God. Thus the law of God ordains, that we render to him, the worship that is due to him; that we should fast, and confess our sins; and receive the holy communion; but the law of God does not tell us how, or when, or how often, it is necessary to perform these acts of religion; He has left it, to his Church, to settle these matters of detail.

Q. Has the Church any right to appoint feast-days?

A. The Christian Church has surely a right, which even the Jewish Church possessed, as we see in Esther ix. and Judith xvi.

Q. Have you any other way of proving that the Church has power to institute festivals of precept?

A. Had she not such power, she could not have done that, in which all modern religionists agree with her,—she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday the seventh day,—a change for which there is no scriptural authority.

Q. Has the Church power to appoint days of fasting?

A. Certainly; for St Augustine, one of the bishops of the early and confessedly pure Church, taxed Arius with heresy, for having disputed that right.

Q. Can the Church forbid us the use of certain kinds of food on particular days?

A. Yes; for she did so even in the time of the Apostles, Acts xv. 29: "That you abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled."

Q. If the Christians of these times had used these forbidden meats, would they have committed sin?

A. Certainly; because, in that case, they would have violated a commandment of the Church.

Q. May not Protestants say, that that which entereth by the mouth defileth not the man?

A. Yes; but we reply, it is not the meat, it is the disobedience, which renders the man unclean; and we ask them, Where did Adam and Eve put the fatal apple? Was it not by the mouth or palate that sin entered the world? How blind that Protestant must be, who puts forward such an argument,—an argument betraying such gross ignorance of

Scripture! Besides, in the passage alluded to, Matth. xv. 11. Christ is speaking, not of food taken in opposition to a precept of his Church, but merely of food taken with unwashed hands.

SECTION II.

Q. Why does the Church forbid certain meats on particular days?

A. Not that in these meats there is any thing unclean, but to chastise and mortify the body.

Q. Were there not some heretics in ancient times, who termed certain kinds of food unclean, and the creatures of the devil?

A. Yes; the Marcionites and Manicheans; and this doctrine of theirs is styled by the Apostle, the doctrine of the devil.

Q. Is it a very ancient Christian practice to abstain from the use of flesh meat two days in the week?

A. Yes; this practice commenced with Christianity itself; for St Epiphanius, in his Catechetical Instructions, says: "An Apostolic law has ordained a fast of two days in the week."

Q. Were Friday and Saturday, the two days of abstinence, always observed over the whole Christian Church?

A. No; in some places the Wednesday and Friday were the days observed; and as to these disciplinary portions of Christian doctrine, it is proper, as St Jerom remarks, to conform to the usages of the Church where we may happen to dwell.

Q. Why have the Greeks appointed Wednesdays and Fridays as their days of abstinence?

A. Because Christ was sold or betrayed on Wednesday, and put to death on Friday.

Q. Why does the Western or Latin Church observe Friday and Saturday?

A. In honour of the death and burial of Jesus Christ.

Q. Does not the Apostle blame the Colossians for saying, "Touch not, taste not, handle not;" and again, "Let no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink?" (Coloss. ii. 16.)

A. The Apostle is speaking here, of the Jewish distinctions between meats; they considered some meats in themselves clean, and others unclean; it is this false and superstitious notion, as well as other abrogated Jewish observances, that the Apostle here condemns; and this is quite evident from the words immediately following those above quoted: "Let

no man therefore judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of a festival day, OR OF THE NEW MOON, OR OF THE SABBATHS."

Q. *Does he not say, 2 Cor. iii. 17: "Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty?"*

A. Why, this text may be quoted with as good a grace to throw off the whole law of God. Liberty!—yes; but a rational and religious liberty consistent with the obligations and duties of one bound to observe the laws of Christ. "*Free*," as St Peter says, "*as free*, and not as making LIBERTY a cloak for malice, but as the servants of God."—1 Peter ii. 16.

SECTION III.

Q. *Who established Lent?*

A. The Apostles.

Q. *How do you prove this?*

A. By the rule of St Augustine (Epist. 18), and by the testimony of the Fathers. "Every practice," says St Augustine, "received by the *whole* Church, whose origin cannot be traced to any bishop, or Pope, or Council, must be regarded as an *Apostolical institution*." Now Lent has been observed in all Christian ages and nations, and cannot be traced, to any merely human source, posterior to the time of the Apostles; therefore it was instituted by the Apostles.

Q. *What do you reply to those who say it was invented by the Council of Nice?*

A. That this cannot be true: for Tertullian and Origen, who lived before that Council, make mention of it in their writings.

Q. *Do you know any Father who has expressly declared that Lent was instituted by the Apostles?*

A. Yes; St Jerom and St Leo declare it formally; the former, Epist. ad Marcel., says: "Following the Apostolical institution, we observe a fast of forty days;" the latter, Serm. 9 de Jejun.: "It was the Apostles, who, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, established Lent."

Q. *Were people, in these times, obliged in conscience to fast during Lent?*

A. Yes; for St Jerom, Epist. ad Mareel., says: "The Montanists fast three Lents in the year; we fast only *one*. That they observe three, is a voluntary act of their own; but we observe *one*, because we are obliged." St Augustine says: "Our fast at any other time is voluntary; but during Lent, we sin if we do not fast."

Q. *Why did the Apostles institute the fast of Lent?*

A. First, in honour of our Saviour's fast of forty days; secondly, in honour of his passion; and, thirdly, to prepare ourselves, in the spirit of mortification, for the better celebration of the Easter solemnity.

Q. *In what manner should Lent be observed?*

A. We ought to attend in this to the Lenten Instruction of our respective bishops; to abstain from the use of flesh meat on the days its use is prohibited; to take only one meal about noon, and a slight collation in the evening. The sick are under no restrictions, when the nature of the disease requires a relaxation of the law; and if a sufficient reason be given to the lawful superior, the collation may be taken in the morning.

Q. *Are all Christians bound to fast?*

A. No; various classes are exempted: 1st, all under twenty-one years of age; 2dly, all the aged who can be prudently deemed too weak to fast; 3dly, women with child and nurses; 4thly, all that are engaged in heavy and laborious employments; and, 5thly, the poor who are never certain of sufficient or regular food.

Q. *What should a Catholic reply to those who scoff and rail at fasting and abstinence?*

A. He should tell them, that those who will not hear the Church, are declared by Christ himself, to be as heathens or publicans. He should repeat to them the words of St Augustine: "It is an impudent folly to blame that which is practised by the whole Church."

Q. *Upon whom does this reproach fall with full force?*

A. Upon Luther, in an especial manner, who blamed fasting, although practised over the whole Church.

Q. *Can you prove, by any scriptural example, that Catholics do well to abstain from certain kinds of food?*

A. Yes; the prophet Jeremias praised the Rechabites for abstaining from wine, because Jonadab, their father, had forbidden them the use of it; hence, the Catholics, cannot do evil by abstaining from any particular food, when the Church, their mother, orders them to do so.

Q. *In what manner can we show a Protestant that he speaks unreasonably against fasts and abstinences?*

A. We say to him: You keep Sunday, and neglect Saturday, because the ancient Church so ordained; why, then, do you not fast and abstain, since for this, you have the command of the same ancient authority?

CHAPTER XII.

ON THE CEREMONIES OF THE CHURCH.

SECTION I.

Q. Why does the Church make use of so many different ceremonies?

A. First, to give external expression to the interior sentiments of respect, devotion, and religion; secondly, to enliven and increase devotion and piety, by moving and striking the senses; thirdly, to lead the simple and illiterate more easily to a knowledge of the mysteries of religion.

Q. Is there nothing superstitious in these ceremonies?

A. There was nothing superstitious in the ceremonies of the Old Law; why, then, should there be any thing superstitious in those of the New?

Q. Is the use of ceremonies authorized by Scripture?

A. St Paul, 1 Cor. xiv. 14, says: "Let all things be done decently and according to order;" and the ceremonies of the Church contribute much to these ends.

Q. What would you say to a Protestant who condemns ceremonies?

A. You make them, I would reply, contribute to the decency, solemnity, and grandeur of the court, the camp, the bar, and the civic festival, and yet you would banish them from the service of God; your ball-room, your dining-room, and drawing-room are all ceremony, and this, to add to your dignity and grandeur in the eyes of men; and you would rob God's service of the solemnity and grandeur to which proper ceremonies so much contribute.

Q. Have you any other reply?

A. Your whole service, I would say, is only one great ceremony. Why build churches, when you can serve God at home? Why go to church, when, in your own dwelling, you can study the Bible; and when your interpretation is as good and as correct as that of your minister? Why have your children baptized, since many of you maintain, that baptism is only a ceremony,—that it does not remit original sin? Why receive the sacrament in the church, if it be only a bit of bread and wine, which you may receive at home? Why do you stand uncovered when the minister prays, since sitting is more convenient and less troublesome?

Q. Why are wax tapers blessed and burnt on the Festival of the Purification in our churches?

A. To put us in mind, that our Saviour, who is the light of the world, appeared, for the first time, on that day, in the Temple.

Q. Why are ashes distributed on Ash-Wednesday, the first day of Lent?

A. To remind us, that we are only dust and ashes, and that we ought to enter upon that season, in which Jesus was humbled and mortified for our sake, with an humble and mortified spirit.

Q. Why are palm branches blessed and distributed on the Sunday before Easter?

A. To remind us of the triumphant entry of our Saviour into Jerusalem.

Q. Why are bells of churches baptized?

A. They are not baptized; they are only blessed in the same manner as churches.

Q. Why are bread, wine, eggs, and other things blessed?

A. To induce the Almighty to shower down his benedictions upon those who use them.

Q. When things are consecrated to the service of God, do they, in reality, become more sacred?

A. Yes; for Christ says, Matt. xxiii. 17, 19. "Ye foolish and blind! for whether is greater, the gold, or the temple that sanctifieth the gold? Ye blind! for whether is greater, the gift, or the altar that sanctifieth the gift?" Here you see the gold *sanctified* by the temple, and the gift by the altar.

Q. Does the Scripture allow the sanctifying or blessing of inanimate things?

A. Certainly; for St Paul, 1 Tim. iv. 4, 5, says: "Every creature of God is good.....for it is *sanctified by the word of God and prayer.*"

Q. What does St Gregory of Nyssa say? (Orat. de Bap. Christi.)

A. "The mystical oil and wine before benediction are common things and of no virtue; but after benediction, both of them have a great virtue."

Q. Is it not a superstitious practice to make use of inanimate things for religious purposes, to procure blessings?

A. Certainly not; for the Scripture would, in that case, teach superstition.

Q. Where does the Scripture authorize this practice?

A. St Mark vi. 13, says: "And they cast out many

devils, and *anointed with oil* many that were sick, and healed them." In St John v. 4, we have: "And an angel of the Lord descended at certain times into the pond, and *the water was moved*; and he that went *down first into the pond, after the motion of the water*, was made whole of whatsoever infirmity he lay under."

Q. *Have you any thing in 4 Kings v. 10, on this subject?*

A. Yes: "And Eliseus sent a messenger unto him, saying, Go and wash *seven times* in the Jordan, and thy flesh shall recover health, and thou shalt be clean;" and, in ver. 14, the order is complied with, and he is made clean.

SECTION II.

Q. *Whence has holy water its virtue?*

A. From the prayers of the Church used in blessing it, and from the prayers and piety of those who use it."

Q. *What are these prayers?*

A. The priest, in blessing it, prays, that against those who use it, the intrigues of the devil may be defeated by the Holy Spirit of God; and the people, whilst using it, pray in these beautiful words: "Sprinkle me, O Lord, with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed; wash me, and I shall become whiter than snow."

Q. *Is the use of holy water of very ancient origin in the Church of God?*

A. It is mentioned in Numbers v.: "And he" (the priest) "shall take *holy water* in an earthen vessel." In Num. viii. 7, it is again mentioned: "Let them be sprinkled with the water of purification." (See also Exod. xix. xxx.)

Q. *May holy water be used under the New Law?*

A. Certainly; for every creature of God may be sanctified by the Word of God and prayer. (1 Tim. iv. 5.)

Q. *Did the early Church use it?*

A. It is mentioned in the Apos. Instit. lib. viii. c. 35; St Cyprian, lib. i. ep. 12; St Jerom, ep. 12; St Basil, de Spirit Sancto, cap. 27; St Greg. Mag. lib. ix. ep. 71; St Epiphani. Hær. 30; Euseb. lib. v. cap. 21.

Q. *Why do Catholics make the sign of the Cross upon themselves? and why is it so frequently used in the Church Service?*

A. Because it is a brief profession of the Christian faith, and its use is derived by universal tradition from the Apostles.

Q. *How is it a profession of our faith?*

A. As often as we make the sign of the Cross, repeating at the same time these words: "In the name of the Father,

and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," we profess ourselves followers of, and believers in, redemption by the Cross, and we at the same time profess our faith in the Three Persons of the Adorable Trinity.

Q. How do you prove that the use of this sign is as ancient as the Church itself?

A. From the testimony of the early Fathers and writers. "At the commencement of all our actions, whether we come in or go out; whether we go to dress, to the bath, to the table, or to rest; whether we take a chair or a light, let us always begin by making the sign of the Cross on our foreheads. This practice is not commanded by a formal law of the Scripture, but tradition has taught it, custom confirms it, and faith observes it."—Tertul. de Corona, cap. 4.

Q. Do any of the other Fathers mention it?

A. Origen says the same thing—Select. in Ezech. cap. 9. St Cyril recommends the same practice to the faithful—Catech. 4. St Basil, de Spirit Sancto, cap. 27, No. 66, expressly tells us that it is an Apostolical tradition.

Q. Why is the sign of the Cross made so often in the holy Sacrifice, the administration of the Sacraments, the benedictions, and exterior worship of the Church?

A. To teach us, that every practice, every ceremony, rite, and service, has its virtue solely through the merits and death of Jesus Christ upon the Cross, and that all God's graces are showered down upon us on account of his sufferings and his blood.

Q. Were not the Christian Copts guilty of superstition, in making the sign of the Cross with a hot iron on the foreheads of their children? and was not this the origin of the Catholic practice?

A. Protestants must be very ignorant to make this assertion. The sign of the Cross, not however made by any painful means, was universally used in the Church. The Copts made the sign of the Cross visible on the foreheads of their children, to prevent them from being stolen by the Mahometans. (See l'Abbé Renaudot.)

SECTION III.

Q. What do the vestments worn by the priest signify?

A. Each of them signifies some accompaniment of our Saviour's passion. The *Amice* signifies the piece of linen with which our Saviour was blindfolded—Matt. xxvi. The *Alb* represents the white garment with which Christ was, in mockery, clothed by Herod—Luke xxiii. The *Girdle*, *Maniple*, and *Stole*, represent the cords and fetters with which

Christ was bound—John xviii. 12, 24. The *Chasuble* represents the purple garments which the soldiers put upon our Divine Saviour.

Q. What is meant by the Cross marked on the chasuble?

A. It represents the Cross which our Saviour carried through the streets of Jerusalem.

Q. What is meant by the corporal and the veil of the chalice?

A. They represent the linen clothes in which our Saviour's body was wrapped, whilst it lay in the tomb.

Q. What does the altar signify?

A. Calvary, upon which our Saviour was crucified, and also the table used for the Last Supper.

Q. Why is the Missal carried before the Gospel from the right to the left side of the Altar?

A. To commemorate the transference of the Gospel of Christ from the Jews, who rejected it, to the Gentiles, who received it.

Q. Why do we stand during the reading of the Gospel?

A. To express our readiness to obey the orders of the Son of God.

Q. Why does the priest put a drop of water into the wine in the chalice?

A. To represent the union of the divine and human natures in Christ.

Q. Why does the priest elevate the consecrated elements?

A. To represent the elevation of the Cross after our Saviour was nailed to it.

Q. Why does the priest divide the Host into three parts, and let one of them drop into the chalice?

A. To signify the separation of our Saviour's body from his blood, and his soul from both; and to represent the descent of his soul to Limbo, where the spirits were in prison.

Q. Why does the priest pray sometimes in a low, and at other times in a loud voice?

A. Because Christ did so, whilst he was hanging on the Cross.

Q. Why does the priest bless the people at the end of Mass?

A. To represent the benediction which our Saviour gave to his disciples before he ascended to heaven.

SECTION IV.

Q. Why is Mass said in the Latin tongue, and not in the vernacular?

A. In the first place, That the service of God may be every where uniformly the same; secondly, That the same words and same prayers may be used, in order to avoid the changes

to which all living languages are so much subject; thirdly, That the same language may be used over the whole Church, that the pastors of every country may understand one another, and that the people passing from one country to another may have no difficulty in joining at the public service, it being every where the same.

Q. Are not the people injured by having the public service in a language which they do not understand?

A. By no means; for surely God understands all languages: prayers will reach His Throne, no matter in what language they may be uttered; and as to the people, they have the prayers of Mass translated into their own tongue in their Prayer Books.

Q. Does not St Paul say, 1 Cor. xiv. 19: "But in the Church, I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue?"

A. Yes; but St Paul is speaking here of instruction, as is evident from the words, "That I may instruct others also." And the Catholic Church in all her sermons, private prayers, and instructions, addresses her children in a language which they do understand.

Q. Do not Protestants make frequent use of 1 Cor. xiv. against Catholics on this subject?

A. Yes; but if Protestants would think before they speak, they would see that this chapter has nothing to do with the question. St Paul, in the whole of this chapter, is reprobating the vain display of miraculous tongues in preachings, exhortations, or instructions, made by recent converts, more to show their gifts, than to glorify God or edify the people.

Q. Can this chapter be turned against Protestants so as to support the Catholic practice?

A. Yes; in ver. 5, St Paul says: "For greater is he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, unless perhaps he INTERPRET, that the Church may receive edification;" now the Catholic service is interpreted for the use of all. Again, ver. 13: "Therefore he that speaketh by a tongue, let him pray that he interpret;" where speaking tongues is not found fault with, if interpretation follow. In ver. 27: "If any speak with a tongue.....let one interpret." In fine, in ver. 30, the Protestant argument is annihilated by the Apostle: "Wherefore, brethren, be zealous to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues."

2. Is the Latin, in reality, an unknown tongue?

1. None but those who are very ignorant will venture to

say that it is. In some countries, it is still the vernacular tongue; the learned of every country are acquainted with it; and of all languages it is, at least to a certain extent, the most universally known.

Q. Is the custom of not performing the service in the vernacular tongue confined to the Catholic Church?

A. No; the Greek, Ethiopian, Indian, and Muscovite schismatics, say Mass in their ancient, and not in their modern tongues. The Syrians and Egyptians say Mass in Syriac, though Arabic be their vulgar tongue. Arabic is the language of the Melchites and Georgians, though they say Mass in Greek.

Q. Is there any other reason why the Mass should be said in Latin?

A. The Mass is the one sacrifice of the whole Church, foretold by Malachi, as an offering to be made in every place under heaven. Hence, all Christians have, in the *oneness* and unchangeableness of the language in which it is offered up, a strict bond of union: unity is preserved by uniformity of rite.

Q. Is it necessary that all the people should understand every word used in the Liturgy?

A. Certainly not. It is only necessary that they should comprehend the nature of the action performed, and unite their intention and devotion with that of the priest.

Q. What do we find in the Jewish Church?

A. The Jews lost the use of the Hebrew language, during the Babylonish captivity, so entirely, that when Nehemias and Esdras read the law from the Scriptures to the people, they were obliged to interpret it. (Nehemias' viii. 13.)

Q. What do you infer from this?

A. The Jews spoke Syriac; the Scriptures were not translated into that language until after the time of our Saviour; yet the Hebrew was still retained in the religious service of the Jews. Besides, from Levit. xvi. and Luke i., it is very evident that the people were not required to be even so near the priest as to be able to hear him; for they were not allowed to be even in the Tabernacle when he prayed for himself and the whole congregation.

CHAPTER XIII.

OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

SECTION I.

Q. How many natures are there in Jesus Christ?

A. Two : the Divine and human natures ; for Jesus Christ is true God and true man.

Q. How many persons are there in Jesus Christ?

A. Only one ; he is a Divine and not a human person, although he has a human nature.

Q. What do you conclude from this ?

A. That all the works of Jesus Christ are divine, and infinite in value ; because, the more excellent the person, the more valuable are his works ; hence, the works of the divine person of Jesus Christ must be infinite in merit.

Q. Was it his Divinity or his humanity that suffered for us?

A. It was his humanity that fasted, prayed, and suffered for us ; still we are right in saying it was God who suffered, because his sufferings and works must be attributed to the person, and the person of Jesus Christ is God.

Q. Where is Jesus Christ ?

A. As he is a Divine person, he is every where ; but his humanity is only in heaven, and on the altar in the holy sacrament. Nor can it be said, that, as his Divinity is every where, so is his humanity, for that does not follow.

Q. Show us, by an example, how it does not follow ?

A. Man's head is intimately connected with his soul ; yet it is not in every place where the soul is, otherwise the head would be in the feet also.

Q. What do we owe to Jesus Christ ?

A. We owe him a sovereign confidence, love, and worship.

Q. What worship is due to him ?

A. That sovereign worship or adoration which is due to God, and to God only.

Q. Do Catholics adore the saints ?

A. God forbid that we should give to any, or all of the saints, the worship which is due only to God ; we honour the saints as God's servants, enriched and honoured with his divine grace.

Q. Do not Catholics consecrate altars, and offer upon them the sacrifice of the Mass to the saints ?

A. No ; altars are erected and consecrated to God alone ; to God alone is the sacrifice of the Mass offered ; the former

under the invocation of the saints, and the latter in memory of the saints.

Q. *Why do we owe to Jesus Christ a sovereign confidence?*

A. Because He is the only Mediator, in the proper sense of the word, between God and man.

Q. *Why do you say he is the only Mediator?*

A. Because He alone could and did satisfy for sin; He alone merited for us all the graces we receive from God.

Q. *Could not a saint have satisfied for the sins of men?*

A. No; all the angels and saints that ever were, or ever will be, could not have satisfied the justice of God for even one mortal sin; because, by sin, an Infinite Being was offended; His justice required infinite satisfaction. Now, this could not be given by any number or quality of saints or angels, who are, and must essentially be, finite creatures; but Christ, being a Divine person, could easily offer sufficient, because *infinite* satisfaction, by restoring to God the glory of which sin had deprived him.

Q. *Has Jesus Christ merited for us all heavenly graces?*

A. Yes; "Blessed be the God and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ."—Ephes. i.

Q. *Do the saints merit graces for us?*

A. They may, by their prayers, obtain graces for us from God, but they cannot, of themselves, merit them. It was Christ alone, who could, and did, merit and purchase them with the price of his blood, both for the saints and for us.

Q. *Why do you say we owe to Jesus Christ a sovereign love?*

A. Because it was He "who delivered us from the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of the Son of his love." (Coloss. i.)

SECTION II.

Q. *Do Catholics glorify Christ and his merits more than Protestants?*

A. Yes; much more. They worship him more frequently and more intensely; they glorify him in his saints, and in the pictures and images of him, which they keep with respect and veneration.

Q. *Why do you say that Catholics worship Christ in his person, more than Protestants?*

A. Because the worship which Catholics render to the person of Christ, present in the sacrament and sacrifice of the altar, shows it sufficiently. In conformity with their creed, they render to Christ, really present, all the adoration in their power.

Q. Why have you said that Catholics honour Christ, in his saints, more than Protestants do?

A. Because Catholics, in honouring the saints, only glorify Jesus, who, by his mercies and graces, has made these saints what they are, worthy of our veneration and imitation; and, as often as Catholics show respect or veneration before a picture or image of Jesus, they uniformly refer both, not to the mere matter before them, but to the prototype, Jesus Christ himself.

Q. Why do you say that Catholics honour the merits of Christ more than Protestants?

A. Because Catholics think more of his sufferings and passion than their adversaries. Catholics observe Lent, a fast of forty days, in honour of his fasting and sorrows; they abstain from the luxury of flesh meat on Friday, in honour of his death; they make frequent use of the sign of the Cross, to keep them in mind of the tortures he endured for sinners, and that it is from the merits of his passion and death on the Cross, that they hope for heavenly strength and grace; they end every prayer by these words, "Through Jesus Christ our Lord;" and the last name they utter, when they are dying, is his holy name; Jesus, therefore, is the only hope of every Catholic; and those of our adversaries who say otherwise, are guilty of the very extreme of impertinence; since all we ask the saints to do, is, to pray for us to our Divine Saviour.

Q. Do not Catholics abandon God, and put their trust in the saints, when they ask the prayers of the saints?

A. No, certainly; not so much as Protestants do, when they ask the prayers of sinful men.

Q. Is it not derogatory to the merits of Christ to invoke the saints?

A. Certainly not; since the Scripture declares, that the prayer even of the just man availeth much.

Q. In what are Protestants deceived on this subject?

A. In supposing that Catholics substitute the saints for Christ, and place their hope in the former, and not in the latter. This is a very mistaken notion. Catholics do not ask grace from the saints; they merely ask the saints to pray that God may grant them all necessary graces through Christ. They say, when addressing God: "*Have mercy on us;*" "*Forgive our sins;*" but when addressing the Blessed Virgin, or the saints: "*Pray for us.*" Catholics know well, that all the virtues, merits, and graces of the saints, are derived, not from themselves, but from Jesus Christ.

Q. Are the merits of the saints, then, useless to us?

A. No; the more agreeable the saints are to God, the more powerful will their intercession be in our favour; consequently, the more meritoriously they have coöperated with God's grace, the more useful will their prayers be to us; in the same manner that we value more the prayers of the man that is *truly* just, than we do, those of him who is *imperfectly* so.

Q. *In whose place do we put the saints?*

A. Not in the place of *Jesus Christ*, but in *our own*; we conjure them to join us in fervent prayer to God, that, through *Jesus Christ*, we may obtain all the graces we stand in need of.

CHAPTER XIV.

ON THE VENERATION OF THE EVER-BLESSED MOTHER OF JESUS.

SECTION I.

Q. *Do Catholics adore the Blessed Virgin Mary, as they adore God?*

A. No: this would be idolatry; but Catholics honour her preëminent prerogatives with a degree of veneration *infinitely inferior* to that which is due to God, but much *superior* to that which is due to the angels and saints.

Q. *Why honour her at all?*

A. Jesus Christ himself, John xii. 26, says, "If any man serve me, him will my Father honour;" surely, then, *even as God honours the Blessed Mary*, for no one *served* his Divine Son with so great fidelity, our veneration for her cannot be misplaced. Even Dr Pearson, a Protestant, (Exp. of Creed, p. 178,) says: "We cannot bear too reverend a regard to the Mother of our Lord, *so long as WE GIVE HER NOT that worship which is due unto the Lord himself.*"

Q. *What do you discover so especially preëminent in the Blessed Virgin, as to demand our especial veneration?*

A. Immediately after the fall of man, the Almighty honours her by pointing her out, four thousand years before the event, as the person whose seed should crush the serpent's head. In Isaiah viii. 13, she is made again the subject of a prophecy, and the sacred lips of the Prophet of the Lord proclaim her virginity,—a virtue which in all ages has obtained the first degree of honour.

Q. *What do we find in Luke i. 26?*

A. We find *she* is chosen, of all the daughters of Eve, to be

the *Mother* of Jesus; the CHOICE is made by the ADORABLE TRINITY; and an ARCHANGEL announces the wonderful tidings to her.

Q. *Is the heavenly message, delivered by the Angel in such a manner, as to give a strong proof of Mary's exalted dignity?*

A. Yes; for she is addressed in language so respectful, as to leave no doubt about the matter. "Hail!" says the Angel, "FULL OF GRACE, THE LORD IS WITH THEE: BLESSED ART THOU AMONG WOMEN."

Q. *What think you of those Protestants who call the Blessed Virgin an ordinary woman?*

A. We pity them—we tremble for them. An Archangel, bearing the words of the Adorable Trinity upon his tongue, tells them they are blasphemers of the saints of God. They utter a falsehood in the face of that exalted creature,—a falsehood in the face of the Angel; nay, a falsehood in the very face of God himself.

Q. *Do the above passages of Scripture exhibit her as an ordinary woman?*

A. No; but the contrary. Is *she* an ordinary woman who is made the subject of prophecy; with whom the Blessed Trinity communes; to whom that Blessed Trinity delegates an ARCHANGEL MESSENGER; who is declared by the unerring lips of that Angel to be FULL OF GRACE, to have THE LORD WITH HER; and, of all the women of the earth, to be peculiarly BLESSED?

Q. *What should Protestants do to justify their language towards the Mother of God?*

A. They should corrupt their Bible a little more, and make the Angel say: "*Hail, thou that art an ordinary woman; thou hast no grace; thou art not blessed more than others; the Lord is as much with the wives and daughters of the holy reforming ministers as he is with thee.*"

Q. *What does Origen, who lived fourteen hundred years ago, say to our present purpose?*

A. He says: "'Hail, full of grace,' &c., is a salutation addressed to MARY ALONE."

SECTION II.

Q. *What says Luke i. 35, on this question?*

A. "And the Angel answering, said unto her" (Mary), "*The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; therefore also that Holy Thing which shall be born of thee, shall be called the Son of God.*"

Q. *Does this passage prove Blessed Virgin an ordinary woman?*

A. Oh! blush for shame, ye reforming pretenders to Scriptural knowledge! Is *she* an ordinary woman, who holds direct intercourse with the Three Persons of the Adorable Trinity?—*she* whose Son is the Son of God?—*she* who is made the mother of the King of kings?—*she* whose Son, as the Angel tells her, shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, who shall sit on the throne of David, and reign over the house of Jacob for ever?

Q. Does she not, in ver. 34, show some doubt, when she asks, "*How shall this be, seeing that I know not man?*"

A. Yes; but the moment that the Angel tells her, that the Holy Ghost shall come upon her, that all is to be the work of the Most High, she submits at once, and with the most edifying docility and humility exclaims: "Behold the handmaid of the Lord; be it done unto me according to thy word."

Q. Is there any thing in the 40th ver. of same chapter, to throw additional light on the exalted dignity of the Blessed Mary?

A. Yes; at the salutation of Mary, the babe leaped in Elisabeth's womb, and Elisabeth was filled with the Holy Ghost.

Q. Did Elisabeth, filled thus with the Holy Ghost, and bearing in her womb the Baptist, than whom none greater was ever born of woman,—did Elisabeth, who was made by God miraculously fruitful, who knew, though not present at the angelic interview, what had passed between the Angel and Mary,—did this honoured, exalted, and inspired Elisabeth, agree with Presbyterians in thinking the Blessed Virgin an ordinary woman?

A. No; she would have shuddered at such language. She proclaimed Mary's blessedness, and, though exalted herself, she considered herself highly honoured by Mary's condescension in paying her a visit. "And Elisabeth spake out with a loud voice, and said, *Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?*"

Q. Is there any other proof, in this chapter, of Mary's preëminent dignity?

A. The poorest daughter of Eve is ennobled and exalted by becoming the mother of a king. How great, then, must be the dignity of Mary, who became the mother of the King of kings and Lord of lords! And, when we consider that Jesus could not dwell in an unholy tabernacle, how ineffably pure and exalted must Mary's spiritual state have been!!

Q. Does not this chapter suggest still some other proofs of her extraordinary and singular dignity?

A. Yes; she was troubled at the extraordinary nature of the angelic salutation; but the Angel Messenger of God calmed her fears, by declaring to her the exalted place she held in the estimation of the Most High. "*Fear not, Mary, thou hast found grace with God.*" But the circumstances which proclaims, above all others, her singular preëminence is, her maternity combined with virginity. She is a virgin, and yet a mother!!! This alone is sufficient to put to shame those unhappy men who seem to glory in reviling the blessed mother of their Redeemer, by proclaiming her, whose SON THEY ADORE, as an *ordinary woman*.

Q. *What do we learn from Luke i. 18?*

A. That the ever-exalted and blessed Mary is a prophetess. She declares of herself that all generations shall call her BLESSED; and surely no one will be bold enough to say, that she who was *full of grace*, and the temple of the *Holy Ghost*, could speak falsehood.

Q. *What inference would you draw from this revealed truth?*

A. That Protestants belong not to the true people of God; for they refuse to fulfil this prophecy. They glory in condemning the Blessed Virgin; they proclaim her an *ordinary woman*, instead of obeying the Scripture, which says, "*From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.*"

Q. *Does not the Blessed Jesus despise Mary, John ii. 46, in these words, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?"*

A. Yes; according to the corrupt Protestant translation; but, according to the Vulgate, which even the *Protestant Grotius* considers the SAFEST VERSION, our Saviour's words are, "*Woman, what is it to thee and to me?*"

Q. *Is the Protestant translation absurd and ridiculous as they understand it?*

A. Certainly; for they would make our Saviour, whose example we are all bound to imitate, *despise and condemn his own mother*. She is honoured by being asked with him to the marriage; she was *familiar* with him previously, for she asks him to work a miracle, which *she clearly knows* he can perform; she does not seem hurt by the *apparent* refusal of Jesus. But the solution of the whole difficulty is found in the fact, that he works the very miracle requested by Mary immediately after. Thus, he works his *first miracle* at the suggestion of Mary. In Luke ii. 49-51, he treats her with the greatest respect; he forgets her not, when, even hanging on the cross in the agony of death, he commends her with his last breath to the care of his beloved disciple; and yet,

after all this, Protestants would make us believe that he despised her, and treated her with studied contempt at the marriage feast of Cana !!

Q. *What would you say to the difficulty, if the Protestant translation was correct?*

A. He sometimes acted in his character as God, and sometimes as man; and, on this occasion, he wished to manifest that, as God, he knew their wants, and would relieve them: in the same manner as, on another occasion, he said to Mary, "*Didst thou not know that I should be about my Father's business?*"

SECTION III.

Q. *What says St Augustine, (Serm. on the Annun.,) as to the dignity of the Blessed Virgin?*

A. "By what praises, O sacred Virgin, I may extol thee, I know not, since thou hast been deemed worthy to bear in thy womb, Him whom the heavens are unable to contain."

Q. *What says St Epiphanius, Adv. Hæres. lib. iii. f. 2?*

A. "Truly life itself was *introduced into the world* by the Virgin Mary.....Eve brought to the human race the cause of death,.....Mary brought the cause of life."

Q. *Is the Greek schismatical Church one with the Catholic Church on this head?*

A. Photius, its great leader, speaks thus, Serm. de Nativ. : "But you, O Blessed Virgin, and also Mother of the Eternal Lord, our propitiation and refuge, *interceding for us with your Son and our God*,...vouchsafe to render us your panegyrists." See Coun. of Ephesus and Nice, Act. 6.

Q. *Is the veneration of the Blessed Virgin an ancient practice in the Church?*

A. It can owe its origin only to the Apostles, for it can be traced to no later age; no man, no body of men, no country, can be pointed out as having originated it; hence, it is evidently Apostolical, and, consequently, it has the authority of heaven.

Q. *What general conclusion would you draw from all that we have said?*

A. That Protestants, in their contempt for the Blessed Virgin, resist the irresistible evidence of their own Bible. They talk of her as an ordinary woman, whilst, in a flood of heavenly light, she shines the most singularly preëminent personage that ever was created. God himself makes honourable mention of her at the very dawn of the world; the prophet Isaiah, centuries before the event, proclaims her the illustrious Virgin Mother of the future Messiah: an *all-wise*

Deity selects *her*, of all the daughters of Eve, to be the Mother of the Redeemer; the *Blessed Trinity* sends an *Archangel* to obtain her consent; she is saluted as *full of grace*; she is assured that the *Lord is with her*—that *she is blessed* among women,—that the *Holy Ghost* will come upon her,—that the *Most High* will overshadow her,—that *her Son* shall be called the *Son of God*,—that she has found grace with God,—that, though a *virgin*, she shall conceive the Son of God, and be at once a *VIRGIN* and a *MOTHER!!!* At the sound of her voice, the infant Baptist *leaps in his mother's womb*, and his mother is filled with the *Holy Ghost*. The inspired Elisabeth salutes Mary in the very words of the Angel: "*Blessed art thou among women*;" and this Blessed Mary herself bursts forth in the spirit of prophecy, and foretells, that *all generations shall call her blessed*; and all generations, during fifteen hundred years, did so, and seven-eighths of Christianity do so at the present day.

Q. *It does appear strange, that Protestants will despise her, whom God has so preëminently sanctified and exalted; have you any additional considerations which may have a tendency to make them blush for their rash and unscriptural conduct?*

A. Yes, many. For nine months did the Blessed Mary carry our Redeemer in her thirree holy womb; she suffered with him at the crib of Bethlehem, wept over his infant body, and wiped away his tears; she sorrowed when he bled in the temple, fled with him to Egypt, tended him during youth, and was sanctified by his Divine companionship during thirty-three years. She was the companion of all his sorrows, sufferings, and tortures; her soul was transfixed by every wound he received; her tears were mingled with every drop of blood which he shed; a living monument of grief, she was found at the foot of the cross, when all had abandoned him. In the dying struggle of Jesus, we find her his anxious care: with his dying breath he commends her to the affectionate tenderness of his beloved disciple. She received into her arms his mangled and bloody body, and sorrowed with those who laid him in the tomb; she sought him early on the morning of the Resurrection, and was found among his Apostles on the day of his Ascension, and on the day of Pentecost; and even all this is not sufficient to induce *wise* and *religious* Presbyterians to regard with respect and veneration the Mother of Jesus!

Q. *Can you address a few words to them personally, which will be likely to bring them to their senses?*

A. I fear, that to prevent them from "*blaspheming them*

that dwell in heaven," is impossible. Still, you might thus address them : " Protestants, do you at all reflect that, when you treat the Blessed Mary with contempt, you insult, as it were, the very HUMANITY of Jesus, for IT WAS FROM HER PURE BLOOD THAT HIS BODY WAS TAKEN ? He was bone of her bone, and flesh of her flesh. Nay, you insult the *purple stream* which redeemed you ; for from her was drawn the *very blood* that flowed from the opening wounds of an all-redeeming Saviour !! Oh ! tremble, ye scoffers of the exalted Mary ! Every insult you offer to the Mother, is an insult to the Son. Beware lest she make against *you* the dreadful appeal made by the souls of the martyrs, Rev. vi. 10 : " How long, O Lord, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood " (our dignity and honour) " on them that dwell on earth ! "

Q. What should Catholics do in a country where torrents of blasphemous insults are every day poured forth against the Mother of God, by men calling themselves Christian ministers ?

A. They should have ever on their lips the sweet address of the Archangel Deputy, thus paraphrased by the holy Athanasius, fourteen hundred years ago : " Be mindful of us, O Blessed Virgin ! Hail, full of grace ! the Lord is with thee ! Thee the angelic and terrestrial hierarchies proclaim blessed. Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. O mistress, lady, intercede for us ! Queen, and Mother of God, pray for us ! "

CHAPTER XV.

ON THE INVOCATION OF ANGELS AND SAINTS.

SECTION I.

Q. Do Catholics worship angels or saints ?

A. No ; we only honour them according to their dignity, and invoke their aid,

Q. Is it by the outward act, or by the inward intention, that we are to be judged, when we show that we honour God or any of his creatures ?

A. We must be judged by our intention, for we honour God, his saints and men, by the same external acts of kneeling, bowing, and uncovering the head. Thus, we do not adore the Queen when we kneel, nor do we worship the magistrate when we bow, yet these are external marks of internal adoration, when made to God.

Q. Do the angels and saints know what passeth on earth? and can they hear us?

A. The prophets, who were mere men, knew, by a special grace, what passed at a great distance: Eliseus knew what passed at an immense distance in the king of Syria's chamber. (4 Kings vi.) He knew also what passed, in his absence, between Naaman and Geezi. (4 Kings v.) St Peter knew the sacrilegious lie of Ananias and Sapphira. Now, surely we must suppose that the angels and saints know more than these men.

Q. Do not even the devils know our actions?

A. All our adversaries admit this, and the Scripture is clear on it: "The accuser of our brethren" (the devil) "is cast forth, who accused them before God day and night." (Apoc. xii. 10.) Now, we must allow the saints, at least, as much knowledge as we accord to the devil.

Q. Do not the angels and saints see all things in God?

A. Yes; and hence they must see our actions, and hear our prayers in him and through him, as it is in him we live, move, and have our being. They see *God face to face*, and know, *him even as they are known*. (1 Cor. xiii. 10, 11, 12.)

Q. Are not the angels and saints our guardians?

A. Yes; and hence they must know all our actions. "See that ye despise not one of these little ones, for I say to you that *their* angels in heaven always see the face of my Father." (Matt. xviii. 10.) "The angels are all ministering spirits, sent to minister for them who shall receive the inheritance of salvation." (Heb. i. 14.)

Q. Do the saints also rule and guide us?

A. Yes; "He that shall overcome and keep my words to the end, to him I will give power over nations, and he shall rule them." (Apoc. ii. 26, 27.) "Thou hast made us" (the saints) "to our God a kingdom and priests, and we shall reign upon the earth." (Apoc. v. 10.)

Q. Do the angels and saints know our necessities and affairs?

A. Certainly; for in Luke xv. 10, it is declared, that "there shall be joy before the angels of God upon one sinner doing penance." They must then see *even* the penitent heart, otherwise they could not rejoice; and as penitence is an internal affection of the mind, if they can see this, they can surely hear our prayers. That the same is true of the saints is evident, for "the saints are as the angels of God in heaven." (Matth. xxii. 31.) They are "equal to the angels." (Luke xx. 36.) "Now, therefore, when thou didst

pray," said the angel to Tobias; "I did present thy prayers to the Lord." (Tob. xii. 12.)

SECTION II.

Q. *Do the angels and saints actually pray for us?*

A. Yes; for this the Scripture is quite clear. "The angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have merey on Jerusalem, and on the cities of Judah, with which thou hast been angry these threescore and ten years? And the Lord answered the angel that talked with me, with *good words* and comfortable words." (Zach. i. 12.) Here four things are proved: An angel takes an *interest* in Jerusalem and the cities of Judah; he *knows* that God is angry with them, and even *how long* God was so; he *intercedes* for them; and God attends to his intercession.

Q. *Can you give us other texts?*

A. "The four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the saints." (Apoc. v. 8.) Saints do not pray for themselves, they are already in a state of bliss; they do not pray for those around them in heaven, for prayers are not needed by those who surround the throne of God. Therefore, the *prayers* of the saints above mentioned, must be prayers for the only beings who need them—the sinners of this world.

Q. *What says Judas Machabeus?* (2 Machab. xv. 12, 13.)

A. That he saw in a vision Onias and Jeremias, who had been long dead, both praying much for the people.

Q. *Should we honour the saints and angels?*

A. Our blessed Saviour tells us that his Father will honour those who have served him. Now, the angels and saints have served him in the most perfect manner; therefore God himself honours the saints and angels; therefore we may honour them. Joshua fell flat on the ground before the angel who said he was the Prince of the host of the Lord. (Josh. v. 14.) Lot went to meet the angels, and adored with his face bowed toward the earth. (Gen. xix. 1.) St John fell down to adore before the feet of the angel. (Apoc. xxii. 8.) By the word *adora*, in these two passages, is not meant the worship due to God, but a high degree of veneration, which may be given to God's most exalted creatures.

Q. *May we invoke the angels?*

A. We may do what we find done by the patriarch Jacob, (Gen. xlviii. 16), who prayed that the *angel* who delivered him from all evil *might bless his children*. And in Osee xii. 4, Jacob prevailed against the angel, and wept and prayed to him. In Gen. xlviii. 17, Jacob says, "Be my name, and the

name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac, invocated on them."

Q. *What says St John?* (Apoc. i. 4.)

A. "Grace to you, and peace from Him that is...and from the seven Spirits that are in the sight of the throne."

Q. *What says Eliphaz to Job, v. 1?*

A. "Call now, if there be any that will answer thee, and turn to some of the saints." Surely this shows that it was an ordinary thing with Job, to invoke the aid of the saints.

Q. *Have you any thing else to add here?*

A. The faithful on earth are members of the same mystical body of Christ, with the saints and angels in heaven; hence, as the component parts of one body, we care for, and are interested in one another. As St Paul says (1 Cor. xii. 25): "If one member suffer any thing, all the members suffer with it; and, if one member glory, all the members rejoice with it."

Q. *What says Dionysius, who lived in the second century?*

A. That "when we beseech the saints to help us, we obtain very great assistance." (Eccl. Hierar. c. 7.) In the same century, St Clement says; "Honour the martyrs, as we honour SS. James and Stephen. God hath made them blessed, and holy men have honoured them." (Apost. Const. 5.)

Q. *What says Origen, in the third century?*

A. "O saints of God, I beseech you to fall down before his mercy" (before God's mercy) "for me, a sinful wretch." (In Lament.) St Ambrose, in the fourth century, says: "He honours Christ, who honours his martyrs; we must pray to the angels who are given to us, as our defenders, and to the martyrs, who are able to pray, that our sins be blotted out." (Serm. 6, and de Viduis.)

Q. *What says the second Nicene Council, Act 6, an. 781?*

A. "Let us do all things with the fear of God, asking the intercession of the unspotted Mother of God, as also of the angels and saints."

Q. *Have learned Protestants admitted the truth of the Catholic doctrine on the above subject?*

A. The Augsburg and Helvetic Confessions, Art. 21 and 5, define it as sound Protestant doctrine, that relative and inferior veneration is due to the saints and angels. The Centuriators admit, that the practice of invoking the saints existed in the third century. Thorndyke, Epil. part. 3, actually teaches the Catholic doctrine, as a truth which cannot be called in question.

Q. *What says even Luther himself?*

A. "I, therefore, with the whole Catholic Church, hold that the saints are to be honoured and invocated by us," (In

Purg. Quorand. Art. t, 1); and again he says, "Let no one omit to call upon the Blessed Virgin and saints, that they may intercede for them." (Prep. ad Mort.)

CHAPTER XVI.

ON IMAGES, RELICS, AND PILGRIMAGES.

SECTION I.

Q. What is the use of images?

A. They serve, in the first place, to adorn the Church; secondly, to instruct the ignorant; and thirdly, to excite devotion.

Q. Do Catholics adore images?

A. No; Catholics adore God only.

Q. Do Catholics invoke images?

A. No Catholic ever thought of such a thing. Catholics neither hope for, nor ask succour or grace from them.

Q. What says the 25th Session of the Council of Trent?

A. That we honour pictures or images, not for any virtue these inanimate things possess, but on account of the originals which they represent. The honour is given to the original, not to the picture; so that in uncovering the head, or kneeling before a picture of Jesus Christ, we honour and adore Jesus Christ himself.

Q. Does not the commandment forbid the making or the use of pictures or images?

A. No; it only forbids warshipping them as gods. "Thou shalt not adore them, nor serve them."

Q. If the Scripture condemned, as idolatry, the making or use of pictures or images, would not the Scripture contradict itself?

A. Yes; for in that case God himself would contradict his own command; and, in fact, order that idolatry which, in the commandment he had forbid, Exod. xxv. 18: "God said to Moses, Thou shalt make also two cherubims of beaten gold on the two sides of the oracle; let one cherub be on one side, and the other, on the other." See also verses 20, 21, and 22 of same chapter.

Q. We see here the likenesses of heavenly things made by the express command of God; did He any where order, in the same manner, the likenesses of earthly things?

A. In the same Exodus xxviii. 33, he does so: "And be-

neath, at the feet of the same tunic, round about, thou shalt make as it were *pomegranates* of violet, and purple, and scarlet, twice dyed, with *little bells* set between." See also verses 34, 35; and 3 Kings, (1 Kings, Prot. Trans.), vii. 23, 24, 25, 29. Again, 3 Kings vi. 29; and 3 Kings x. 19. Read also Osee iii. 4.

Q. *Did God ever use an image for miraculous purposes?*

A. Yes; in Num. xxi. 8: "And the Lord said to him," (Moses) "Make a *brazen serpent*, and set it up for a sign: whosoever being struck shall look on it, shall live;" and in verse 9, you will see the miraculous effect produced.

Q. *You have said that pictures and images adorn the House of God, is it proper to adorn temples?*

A. Certainly. The Royal Prophet says, Ps. xxv. 8; "I have loved, O Lord, the *beauty* of thy house, and the place where thy glory dwelleth." And in 2 Kings vii. 2, (Protest. 2 Sam.) "David is ashamed to dwell in a house of cedar, whilst the *Ark of God is lodged within skins*." See also Ps. cxxxi. 3, 4, 5. Catholics glory in the splendour of God's house and the grandeur of his service; and in this they imitate the example of David and Solomon, (see opening of his temple) rather than the niggardly parsimony of the traitor Judas, who wished to sell the box of precious ointment, for which parsimony he received such a severe reprimand from Christ himself.—John xii. 3, &c.

Q. *Why do Protestants strip the House of God of every ornament, whilst they are so profusely liberal in the decoration of their own dwellings, and all their worldly monuments and public buildings?*

A. It is because their religion is essentially that of this world. They flatter themselves that they may obtain heaven at the least possible expense. They give God's glory to themselves and to their worldly heroes; and their ministers are too much engaged in providing for wives and families, to give themselves any trouble about, or spend any of their incomes in, the erection or decoration of splendid temples to the living God.

SECTION II.

Q. *In what manner do Catholics honour relics?*

A. As precious remains, which bring to their remembrance distinguished sanctity, and as dear pledges, which animate their confidence, in the communion and intercession of saints.

Q. *Did the first Christians honour relics?*

A. Certainly; and it is from them that we have learned to do so.

Q. Repeat St Augustine's words, Epist. 103, and Quint.

A. "I send you the relics of St Stephen, to which pay due honour." St Jerom wrote a whole book against Vigilantius, who was the first to deny honour to holy relics.

Q. Have relics any secret or interior power or virtue?

A. No; but God has often granted great favours through them.

Q. Do Catholics adore, or worship relics?

A. No; this would be rank idolatry. All Catholics can, with a safe conscience, say, "Cursed is he who commits idolatry, who prays to images or relics, or worships them as gods."

Q. Has God himself honoured relics, and through them wrought astonishing miracles?

A. Yes; the waters of the Jordan being struck by Eliseus with the *mantle* of Elias, suspended their course, and afforded him a dry passage, 4 Kings ii. 14. (Prot. Ver. 2 Kings ii. 14.) And, in verse 8, the same astonishing prodigy was performed by the same means. Read the wonders performed by means of the *rod* of Moses. (Exod. vii.) See also 1 Kings (*alias* Sam. v.) and also Sam. vi. 19, as to the wonders God was pleased to perform on account of the *Ark*, which was certainly a mere relie. See also 2 Kings (*alias* Sam. vi. 6, 7) and 4 Kings (*alias* 2 Kings xiii. 21), where the *bones of the prophet Eliseus raised a dead man to life*.

Q. Are any such examples to be found in the New Testament?

A. Yes; many such, Matth. ix. 20, 21. The woman troubled with an issue of blood for twelve years is cured by touching *the hem of our Saviour's garment*. In Matth. xiv. 36, as many as *touched the hem of his garment were made whole*. In Acts xix., the *handkerchiefs and aprons* which had *touched the body of St Paul, removed diseases, and expelled devils*. In fine, the *shadow* of St Peter healed multitudes that were sick and troubled with unclean spirits. (Acts v. 15, 16.)

Q. What inference do you draw from all this?

A. That Protestants show a lamentable ignorance of Scripture, when they rail against holy relics. If God has so honoured them, and has wrought such wonderful miracles by them, as honoured instruments, under both the Old and New Law, should not all Christians honour them? and may not those men be deemed wicked, who despise the venerable instruments, used by the Almighty, to display the wonders of his power?

SECTION III.

Q. Is there any spiritual advantage to be derived from religious pilgrimages?

A. Yes; when they are performed in the spirit of true devotion.

Q. What can be the use of a pilgrimage to any particular place, since God is every where?

A. It is useful in this, that, though God is every where, some places are better calculated to excite devotion than others; for example, the scenes of any of the great wonders or triumphs of Christianity, the Shrine of SS. Peter and Paul, the Crib of Bethlehem, or the thrice holy soil of Mount Olivet or Mount Calvary.

Q. What succour does devotion find in a pilgrimage to such places?

A. We pray with more fervour, and are humbled more sensibly, when we find ourselves as grievous sinners wandering amongst the monuments of redemption.

Q. Can we glorify God by doing, for his honour, what he has not commanded?

A. Certainly; David, 2 Kings xxiii. 15, 16, 17, whilst he burned with an ardent thirst, poured forth the fresh water *as an offering to the Lord*; and, by this act of mortification, which was not commanded, he glorified God. The Blessed Virgin surely glorified God by her voluntary chastity, which was not commanded. (St Luke i.) St Paul glorified God by the voluntary chastisement of his body. (1 Cor. ix.)

Q. Can you give us any scriptural example of religious pilgrimages?

A. Elcana and Ann went every year to Silo to pray; and the Blessed Jesus and his Virgin Mother, made a pilgrimage every year to Jerusalem, to pray in the temple. These surely are good and sufficient authorities.

CHAPTER XVII.

ON JUSTIFICATION.

SECTION I.

Q. What is justification?

A. It is a grace which makes us friends of God.

Q. Can a sinner merit this justifying grace?

A. No, he cannot; because all the good works which the

sinner performs whilst he is in a state of mortal sin, are *dead works*, which have no merit sufficient to justify.

Q. Is it an article of the Catholic faith, that the sinner, in mortal sin, cannot merit the grace of justification?

A. Yes; it is decreed in Sess. 6, chap. vii. of the Council of Trent, that neither faith, nor good works, preceding justification, can merit the grace of justification.

Q. How then is the sinner justified?

A. He is justified gratuitously by the pure mercy of God, not on account of his own or any human merit, but purely through the merits of Jesus Christ; for Jesus Christ is our only Mediator of redemption, who alone, by his passion and death, has reconciled us to his Father.

Q. Why then do Protestants charge us with believing, that the sinner can merit the remission of his sins?

A. Their ignorance of the Catholic doctrine is the cause of this, as well as many other false charges.

Q. Must we then conclude, that the sinner cannot, by good works, obtain the grace of justification?

A. The sinner may obtain the grace of justification by good works proceeding from a broken and penitent heart, because these are necessary predispositions and conditions; but no works of his own can ever MERIT the grace of justification.

Q. What part has faith in the justification of the sinner?

A. It is its root or foundation, the first step to its attainment, an all-necessary condition, without which no man can ever be justified; because the Apostle says, "*without faith, it is impossible to please God.*"

Q. But is faith alone sufficient to justify the sinner?

A. No; God requires other dispositions in order to the reception of justifying grace. He requires the sinner to fear God, to love God, to hope in God, to be sorry for past sin, and to have a well-grounded purpose not to sin again.

Q. Does God require these as necessary conditions, or as meritorious works?

A. As necessary conditions, without which he will not receive the sinner in grace.

Q. What do the Scriptures say on this subject?

A. "And when thou shalt seek there the Lord thy God, thou shalt find Him; yet so, if thou seek Him with all thy heart, and all the affliction of thy soul." (Deut. iv. 29.) "But if the wicked man do penance for all his sins which he hath committed, and keep all my commandments, and do judgment and justice, living, he shall live, and shall not die." (Ezek. xviii. 21.) "If you keep my commandment, you shall

abide in my love.... You are *my friends*, if you do the things that I *command you*." (John xv. 10, 14.)

Q. *What do you conclude from these passages?*

A. In the first place, that the sinner can never be justified, unless he comply with these necessary conditions; and, secondly, that faith alone is not sufficient to justify him.

Q. *Does not the Baptist say, John iii. 36: "He that believeth in the Son hath life everlasting?"*

A. Yes; but St John speaks here of efficacious faith; that is, he who believeth in the Son, so as to believe all that he teaches, and practise all that he commands, shall have everlasting life.

Q. *Does not St Paul, Rom. iii. 28, say: "We account a man to be justified by faith, without the works of the law?"*

A. True; but St Paul is speaking here of the *Jewish*, not the Christian law, for St Paul cannot contradict St James. Now, St James says, in words about which there can be no dispute, ii. 22, 24: "Seest thou that faith did coöperate with his works, and by works faith was made perfect?..... do you see, that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only?" and, ver. 26, he adds: "For even as the body without the spirit is dead, so also faith without works is dead."

Q. *Does not St Paul, Rom. v. 1, say: "Being justified therefore by faith, let us have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ?"*

A. Yes; but the same St Paul (1 Cor. xiii. 1, 2.) says: "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as a sounding brass;...and if I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and *have not charity*, I am nothing." So that it is quite clear the Apostle speaks, in the passage quoted, of that lively faith, animated by charity, which is ever producing good works.

Q. *Protestants suppose, that good works are the necessary effect of faith, as heat is of fire, or light, of the sun; is this supposition correct?*

A. No; for St John xii. 42, says: "Many of the chief men also BELIEVED in him; but because of the Pharisees, they did NOT CONFESS him;...for they loved the glory of men more than the glory of God."

SECTION II.

Q. *Can any one, who is in a state of mortal sin, merit heaven by any good work or works?*

A. No; he can neither merit justification, nor heaven; because, all the works he performs, while in a state of mortal sin, are dead works, and, of course, have no merit.

Q. Can one, who is in a state of grace, merit heaven?

A. The just, who are in a state of grace, may, by good works, merit an increase of glory; but even they can never, by any or every good work, merit the *first degree* of glory, that is, a right to heaven.

Q. To whom do we owe our permission to enter heaven?

A. Solely to the mercy of God and the merits of Jesus Christ; for it is by the sufferings and death of Jesus that we acquired heaven as our inheritance; and it is God's mercy alone, which gave us such a Mediator and Redeemer.

Q. Why have you said that the just may, by good works, merit an increase of glory in heaven?

A. Because, in Scripture, heaven is proposed to us, as a recompense; and a recompense, or reward, is due only to merit.

Q. What does St Matthew say on this matter? (v. 12.)

A. "Be glad and rejoice, for your reward is very great in heaven." Prov. xi. 18: "But to him that soweth in justice, there is a faithful reward." St James i. 12: "Blessed is the man that endureth temptation, for when he hath been proved, he shall receive the crown of life, which God hath promised to them that love him." 2 Tim. iv. 7: "I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; as to the rest, there is laid up for me a crown of justice, which the Lord, the just Judge, will render to me in that day."

Q. What have Protestants to object against this scriptural doctrine?

A. Nothing that is either rational or scriptural; for the learned among themselves have taught the very same. The *Apology for the Protest. Confess of Augsburg*, p. 96, says: "We teach, that good works merit a temporal and spiritual reward in this world, as well as a spiritual reward in the next."

Q. What then have Protestants to say to Catholics on the subject of merit and good works?

A. All they have to say arises from their ignorance of the Catholic doctrine.

Q. What is that which gives their value to good works?

A. Sanctifying grace, which is within us.

Q. Is this sanctifying grace our own, or is it from God?

A. It is the pure gift of God's liberality to us.

Q. How does St Paul express himself on this subject? (Rom. v. 3.)

A. "The charity of God," he says, "is poured forth in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, who is given to us."

Q. *What are the effects of sanctifying grace?*

A. It makes us the friends and children of God.

Q. *To whom do we owe this inestimable grace?*

A. To the merits of Jesus Christ, and to these alone.

Q. *Have you any thing to remark on the efficacy of the merits of Christ?*

A. Yes; he was not satisfied with meriting heaven for us; he also, by his grace, put us in a condition to merit greater degrees of glory in heaven.

Q. *Does not our Saviour say, Luke xvii. 10: "So you also, when you shall have done all those things that are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants?"*

A. This is quite in accordance with our doctrine; we are certainly unprofitable servants to God, whatever good we do; for nothing which we can do, either adds to, or takes from, His essential glory. We are not, however, unprofitable servants to ourselves, since these good works secure for us the rewards God has been pleased to promise.

Q. *Could God order us to perform good works without promising us any recompense?*

A. Certainly; because we are *his* creatures, and the grace which enables us is *his*. The Council of Trent, Sess. xvi., chap. 16, says: "God's goodness to man is so great, that he even desires his own gifts to be converted into our merit."

Q. *Have we reason to trust much in our good works?*

A. "God forbid," says the same Council, "that any Christian should glory, or confide in himself, and not in the Lord."

Q. *How is it, then, that Protestants reproach Catholics with placing too much confidence in their good works?*

A. They reproach us, because they do not know us; and the only return we should make for their ill-treatment of us, is to pray, as Christ did for the ignorant Jews, who put him to death: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

SECTION III.

Q. *Can a man satisfy for his own sins?*

A. No; neither man nor angel, nor both men and angels, can ever satisfy for one mortal sin. Jesus Christ alone could and did satisfy for our sins.

Q. *Can we apply to ourselves the satisfaction of Jesus?*

A. We can, certainly, with the help of God's grace.

Q. *How is the satisfaction of Christ applied to us?*

A. In two ways, either when we receive a full remission of temporal, as well as eternal punishment, or when the eternal

is remitted, and some temporal punishment is reserved for us to endure.

Q. *In what case are both the eternal and temporal punishments remitted by the application of the satisfaction of Christ to our souls?*

A. In baptism, by which all sin, and all punishment due to sin, is remitted.

Q. *When are the satisfactions of Jesus so applied to our souls, that, though the eternal punishment be remitted, we may have some temporal punishment to endure?*

A. Commonly in the sacrament of penance.

Q. *Are not the guilt and the punishment remitted together?*

A. No; for it often happens that God, in forgiving the sinner, changes the eternal punishment, which he has deserved by his sins, into a temporal or temporary punishment.

Q. *Make this clear by an example from 2 Kings xii?*

A. David is guilty of murder, which deserves the eternal punishment of hell. Nathan warns him of his danger. David repents: "I have," says he, "sinned against the Lord." Nathan replies, "*The Lord also hath taken away thy sin; THOU SHALT NOT DIE.*" Behold the eternal punishment taken away; but, mark what follows, a temporal punishment is substituted in its place: "Nevertheless, because thou hast given occasion to the enemies of the Lord to blaspheme; *for this thing, THE CHILD THAT IS BORN TO THEE SHALL SURELY DIE.*" (Prot. Vers. 2 Sam. xii.)

Q. *Give another scriptural example, that all doubt may be removed?*

A. In the same Book, xxiv. (Protest. Ver. 2 Sam. xxiv.) David repents of his sinful pride in numbering the people; God forgives him, but on condition that he should suffer, as a *temporal punishment*, either *seven years of famine, or three months of flight before his enemies, or three days of pestilence?* and, in addition, the prophet Gad orders him to erect an altar, and offer sacrifice to the Lord.

Q. *Can the penitent pay, in any manner, the debt of TEMPORAL punishment which is due to the justice of God?*

A. Yes; as is quite evident from the above two passages. Indeed, the Scripture counsels it in express terms. Daniel iv. 24: "Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable to thee; redeem thou thy sins with alms, and thy iniquities with works of mercy to the poor." Our Saviour himself, Luke chap. xi. 41, says, "GIVE ALMS, and BEHOLD ALL THINGS ARE CLEAN UNTO YOU."

CHAPTER XVIII.

ON MORTAL AND VENIAL SIN.

Q. What do you mean by mortal and venial sin?

A. That some sins rob the soul of justice and spiritual life, and render it deserving of hell; whilst others do not deprive the soul of justice, but only weaken both justice and charity.

Q. Is it evident that some sins kill the soul?

A. Clearly so. "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." (Matt. xix. 17.) "The wages of sin is death." (Rom. vi. 23.) "The unjust shall not possess the kingdom of God;.....Neither idolators, nor adulterers, nor drunkards, &c., &c., shall ever enter the kingdom of God." (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.)

Q. Are there any sins which rob not the soul entirely of justice?

A. Our Saviour himself teaches us that there are: "Whosoever shall be angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment; whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; and whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell-fire." (Matt. v. 23.) Here Christ points out three sins, and only one of the three deserves, he says, damnation.

Q. Have you any other text?

A. Yes: "Blind guides, who strain at a gnat, and swallow a camel." (Matt. xxiii. 24.) Here Christ shows that some sins, compared with others, are as a gnat, when compared to a camel. Now, surely, no mortal sin can be compared to a gnat. Mortal sins, to say the least, must all be *camels*. In Luke vi. 42, our Saviour speaks of sins like a beam, and sins like a mote in the eye. Now, do Protestants think mortal sins motes? If so, what will the large beam represent?

Q. Can you add any other argument?

A. In 1 Cor. iii. 13, 14, 15, it is said: "That there are sins for which we shall suffer loss, but from which we shall be saved, yet so as by fire." These must evidently be venial sins, for we have proved that mortal sins deserve hell, and the fire of hell is not a saving, but an ever-destroying fire. In James i. 14, 15, it is said, that "concupiscence, when it has conceived, bringing forth *sin*" (evidently venial); "but this sin, when it is consummated, bringeth forth *death*," (clearly mortal, as its punishment shows.)

Q. What say you to Matth. xii. 37, where we are told we must render an account for every idle word?

A. That these idle words must be venial sins, as we have to *account* for them, but not mortal, or damning sins, since otherwise it were better we had no tongues, for if idle words are soul-destroying sins, the world is in the most desperate of all possible conditions.

Q. Is it not said, in Prov. xvi. 24, that the just man falls seven times?

A. Yes; and these falls, or failings, must be venial, since, were this not so, "he could not remain just." St James iii. 2, says, "in many things we all offend," which evidently alludes to venial faults; for St James includes himself and all others, and we know that he offended not mortally, nor did Zachariah and Elisabeth, who were *just before God* (Luke i. 6,) though, according to St James, they, too, offended in many things.

Q. What did the Fathers teach on this subject?

A. Tertullian speaks of sins which are small and daily sins. (De Anima. c. 17.) Origen says, "By the wood, hay, and stubble," (1 Cor. iii.) "are meant some sins so light, that they may be compared to those light materials which are easily consumed." (Hom. 14 in Levit.) St Jerome condemns Jovinian for holding all sins to be equal. Speaking of the beam and the mote, Matt. vi. 42, he says, our Saviour here alludes to those who, being guilty themselves of mortal sins, tolerate not lesser sins in their brethren, thus straining at gnats and swallowing camels. (Contra Jovin., c. 15, 16.)

Q. What says St Augustine, Enchir. c. 22?

A. "A small falsehood for the good of others, which does not injure any one, *may* be only venial.....For daily, short and light sins, the daily prayer of the faithful satisfies.....There are certain venial sins, without which even the just do not live." (De Spiritu et Litera.)

Q. What say you to Ezek. xviii. 20: "The soul that sinneth shall surely die?"

A. The prophet is speaking of enormous crimes, which he mentioned before, such as theft, idolatry, &c.

Q. What say you to James ii. 10: "He that offends in one point, offends in all?"

A. Yes; in one mortal sin, to which St James evidently alludes in ver. 11, where he mentions murder and adultery.

CHAPTER XIX.

ON INDULGENCES.

Q. *What is an Indulgence?*

A. It is a remission of the temporal punishment due to venial sin, and also to mortal sin, after the eternal punishment has been remitted, as before mentioned, in the case of David. (Chap. xvii. sec. 3.)

Q. *Are sins remitted by Indulgences?*

A. No; sins are remitted by the sacraments of baptism and penance.

Q. *Has the Church the power to remit temporal punishments?*

A. When the applicant or sinner is properly disposed, the Church has power to remove every obstacle to his admission into heaven; but a debt of temporal punishment, due to God's justice, is a temporary obstacle; therefore the Church has power to remove it. That this proposition is most certainly true, is evident from Matt. xviii. 18: "*Whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven.*" From which it is more than evident, that the powers of the Church, over sin and its punishment, are not in any way confined or restrained, provided always, that the sinner have the proper dispositions; and if the Church has power to remit the sin itself (as beyond all doubt she has), she has surely power to remit the *temporal punishment* due to sin.

Q. *Are Indulgences of very ancient date in the Church?*

A. Yes; since the very commencement of Christianity.

Q. *Give us a clear instance of their early use?*

A. St Paul granted an Indulgence to the incestuous Corinthian, by the remission of the temporal punishment to which he had subjected that public sinner; and the Apostle declares, that it is by the power of Christ, and in Christ's person, he acts in this matter, 2 Cor. ii. 10: "*For what I have pardoned, if I have pardoned any thing, for your sakes have I done it in the person of Christ.*"

Q. *Is this temporal punishment always inflicted in this life?*

A. It may be inflicted here or in Purgatory; and if not discharged here, it must be discharged hereafter.

Q. *Do the Fathers of the early Church speak of Indulgences or the remission of temporal punishment?*

A. Yes; St Cyprian, Epist. 18, says, that the bishops of the Church granted (like St Paul) a remission of the

canonical penances and penitential works, by the mediation of holy confessors or martyrs, "the abundance of whose merits might supply for the want of their brethren," according to that of St Paul: "I now rejoice in suffering for you." (Col. i. 24.)

Q. *Have any Councils spoken on this subject?*

A. The Council of Ancyra (anno 314) orders the bishops, "having considered the conduct of the penitents, to show them mercy, or, to lengthen the time of their penance."

Q. *What inference do you draw from this practice of the Church in ancient times?*

A. That, in the remission of the canonical penances, she also remitted so much of the temporal punishment before God.

Q. *Why? what connexion is there between the one and the other?*

A. The canonical penances were inflicted by God's Church as a temporal punishment due to sin. This, as inflicted by his Church, is accepted by God, either as the whole or a part of what his justice demands; for whatever his *true Church* does, is done by *himself*: "As my Father sent me, even so I send you;" "Whatsoever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed also in heaven;" "He that heareth you, heareth me," &c. &c.

Q. *Can any Indulgence or leave be granted by any power on earth, to commit sin?*

A. No; nor can God himself give leave to commit what is of its own nature sinful.

Q. *Does not the Pope give leave to tell lies, to commit perjury, to make mental reservations, to be disloyal, and persecute Protestants, when these licences appear to him to promote the Catholic cause?*

A. No; these are all Protestant calumnies.

Q. *Would dispensations or pardons granted for any such ends, have any validity?*

A. No; they would only add sacrilege to blasphemy.

Q. *Is it an article of the Catholic faith, that temporal punishment is remitted before God by an Indulgence?*

A. It is not; but it is an established opinion amongst all theologians, morally speaking; and their opinion is well supported by Scripture.

Q. *What has the Church decided on this subject?*

A. That God has left in his Church the power of granting Indulgences, and that Indulgences are extremely advantageous to the Christian people. (Decret. 1, de Indul. Sess. 25.)

Q. Is there any thing in this decree with which Protestants can reasonably be offended?

A. No; for they themselves grant Indulgences, as is evident from the history of the *catty stool*. For particular sins, those who were rich were mulcted in a pecuniary fine, and those who were poor were obliged to give *satisfaction* before the whole congregation. Now, either this was of use to the sinner, or it was not; if the former, it was an Indulgence; if the latter, then for what purpose was it practised? For further proof of the practice of the ancient and pure Church, see Coun. of Nice (anno 325) Can. xii. Conc. Gen. T. 2.

CHAPTER XX.

ON PRAYER FOR THE DEAD.

Q. Do Catholics pray for the dead?

A. Yes; we hold that it is holy and charitable to offer prayers and oblations to God for the souls of the faithful departed.

Q. How do you prove that this practice is commendable?

A. We have already proved the existence of venial sin, and we will shortly prove the necessary existence of Purgatory; now, from these two truths, the propriety of prayers for the dead follows necessarily.

Q. Why so?

A. Because a Christian may die guilty of *only venial sin*, and as nothing defiled can enter heaven, by praying for such Christian we appease God's anger against him, and shorten the duration of his sufferings in a middle state, in the same manner as we benefit the living by praying for them. Purgatory exists, because there are some who die either in venial sin, or before they have fully satisfied the justice of God, by enduring the temporal punishment due to mortal sin. This punishment must be endured *somewhere*; not, however, in hell, as that is the abode of the damned, out of which there is no redemption; nor in heaven, for nothing defiled can enter there,—the last farthing must be paid; therefore this debt of justice must be paid in Purgatory. But, if so, then we, by praying for the dead, shorten the period of their sufferings in a middle state; we make for them, by prayers and oblations, a satisfaction which they themselves cannot make, as they are not now in a state to *merit*.

Q. Can you prove prayers for the dead from Scripture?

A. In 2 Machab. xii. 46, it is said: "It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins." Now, even though our enemies do not admit this book as the Word of God, still, as history, it proves, beyond a doubt, that, in the old law, God's people prayed for the dead.

Q. What have we in 2 Kings ii.?

A. That David mourned, wept, and fasted, after the death of Saul and Jonathan; and, in 2 Kings ii. the men of Jabes Galaad, fasted and mourned for it, seven days together, without reproof. Very useless penances, if the dead were not benefited by them.

Q. What say you to that passage of 1 Cor. xv. 29: "What shall they do who are baptized for the dead? Why are they baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?"

A. There are two kinds of baptism: the baptism of water, and the baptism of penance. To the latter Christ alludes, when he says, "I am to be baptized with a baptism," meaning his passion, and his sufferings for sin. To this second baptism St Paul evidently alludes, when he speaks of people being baptized for the dead, as of a common practice existing in his time, and with his approbation. His words have this meaning:—Some of you deny that the dead rise again; if they do not, why do you suffer, for their good, the baptism of penance, prayer, fasts, and mortifications?

Q. Does not St Paul (2 Tim. i. 16) pray for the dead?

A. Yes; even Jeremy Taylor admits, that he prayed there for Onesiphorus, after he was dead.

Q. What say the Fathers of the early and pure Church on this subject?

A. St Clement, the fourth Pontiff from Peter, says: "Peter taught us to bury the dead, to perform their funeral rites, to give alms, and pray for them." (Ep. 1. de S. Petro.) Tertulian, de Corona Milit., says: "Make yearly oblations for the dead." St Cyril, in the fourth century, says: "We beseech God for all who have died before us, believing that the dreadful sacrifice which is put on the altar, is the greatest help of the souls, for which it is offered." (Catech. Mistag. 5.) St Augustine, in the fifth century, says: "The souls of the dead are eased by the piety of the living, when the sacrifice of the Mediator is offered for them." (Enchir. 110.)

Q. Does not St John say, "There is a sin unto death: for that, I say not, that any man ask?" (1 John v. 16.)

A. Certainly; but St John here speaks of mortal sin, for

he immediately adds, that there is a sin not unto death, for the forgiveness of which a man may ask; and this very passage proves both prayer for the dead and Purgatory; for St John must be speaking here of prayer for one that is dead, as during life, there is no sin, for the forgiveness of which we may not and ought not to pray.

CHAPTER XXI.

ON PURGATORY.

SECTION I.

Q. How do you prove that there is a Purgatory, or middle state between hell and heaven?

A. It is proved, 1st, from the Old Testament; 2dly, from the New Testament; and, 3dly, from tradition.

Q. What is your proof from the Old Testament?

A. 2 Machab. xii. where Judas, the valiant commander, collects and sends to Jerusalem twelve thousand drachmas of silver, for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead. "It is therefore," says this passage, "a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins."

Q. What do you conclude from this passage?

A. That besides heaven and hell, there is a middle state; because, as the souls in heaven require not the aid of prayer, so the souls in hell can receive no benefit from it; hence there must be some third state of souls, in which prayer is beneficial to them.

Q. But is this book of Machabees a canonical book, containing God's Word?

A. It has been recognised as such from the earliest ages. St Augustine (Civit. Dei. 36) says: "The Church of God has always acknowledged the Machabees as a canonical book." Protestants have rejected this book, like many other books of Scripture, because it contains doctrines opposed to their novel inventions. They do not seem to reflect, that it is on the authority of the Catholic Church they know the Scriptures which they admit, to be God's Word, and they have that authority for this book as well as for the rest.

Q. Does not the author of Machabees make an apology for the errors it contains?

A. Yes; for errors of style, but not for errors in fact or

doctrine. See, for another argument on this subject of Purgatory, Gen. xxxvii. 35.

SECTION II.

Q. How do you prove from the New Testament, that there is a Purgatory?

A. From Matth. xii. : "Whosoever speaketh a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him ; but whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, *neither* in this world, *neither* in the world to come."

Q. What does St Augustine draw from this passage? (Civit. Dei. xiv. lib. 21.)

A. That some sins are forgiven in the next world, otherwise this passage of Scripture would be nonsense. Now sins are not remitted in heaven, for no sin can enter there ; nor in hell, for there is no redemption from that awful abode ; therefore there must be some third place, where some sins are forgiven.

Q. Cite the words of St Paul. (1 Cor. iii.)

A. "And the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide.....he shall receive a reward ; if any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss ; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire."

Q. What on this do you remark?

A. There can be no pain, or suffering, or fire in heaven ; nor is the fire of hell for salvation, but damnation ; therefore this fire, which worketh unto salvation, must be in Purgatory.

Q. What says the same Apostle? (Philip. ii. 10.)

A. "That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow of those that are in heaven, on earth, and under the earth."

Q. How do you reason on this?

A. By those under the earth, are evidently meant, not the dead bodies, but the souls of the dead not yet in heaven. Now these souls are certainly either in hell or in Purgatory. But St Paul did not allude to those in hell, for he knew well that they would not bow the knee to Jesus ; therefore he must allude to souls in some other place, which is not heaven, or earth, or the hell of the damned ; therefore that place exists, and it is that place which Catholics call Purgatory.

Q. What does St John say (Apoc. xxi. 27) *of heaven?*

A. "And there shall not enter into it any thing defiled."

Q. What do you conclude from this?

A. That there must be some place for the purification of souls after death ; because the Scripture assures us, that even

the just man falls seven times ; and can any one in his senses suppose that many will not die without expiating these faults ? With these, they cannot enter heaven, which receiveth nothing defiled ; they cannot be sent to hell, for they are, according to Scripture, JUST. Therefore there must be a third place, where these failings of even the just man will be expiated. See also 1 Cor. xv. 29 ; 2 Tim. i. 18, where St Paul prays for Onesiphorus after he was dead.

Q. Did any one ascend to heaven before our Saviour ?

A. No ; for in St John iii. 13, Christ says : " No man hath ascended up to heaven, but He that came down from heaven."

Q. Where then were all the just souls of the Old Testament until Christ's ascension ?

A. They were not in heaven, they were not in hell ; therefore they were in some middle place or state.

Q. What is the meaning of that passage, 1 Peter iii. 19, which says, that Christ went and preached unto the spirits in prison ? Where were these spirits ?

A. They were not in heaven, for there they would require no preaching ; they were not in hell, for there preaching could be of no use to them ; therefore they were in some middle state, where the preaching of Christ could avail them, and this state, is what Catholics call Purgatory.

Q. Does not the Scripture say, that as the tree falls so it shall lie ?

A. Yes ; but this means, simply, that every man who dies is either saved or lost ; and it may also refer to the state of the soul after the last judgment. The moment man dies, his ultimate fate is decided, either for the south or the north, for heaven or hell.

Q. Is it not said (Apoc. xiv.) : " Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord, for they shall rest from their labours ?"

A. Yes ; thrice blessed, we say ; but this text only alludes to martyrs and such as die free from all sin and debt of temporal punishment, and such, of course, require no purification. They really die in the Lord.

Q. Does not Christ say to the good thief, " This day thou shalt be with me in paradise ?"

A. Yes ; but it is not clear, that by paradise, is here meant heaven and not Purgatory ; and even if this were clear, a miracle of God's grace, wrought in favour of a penitent, on the very day the world was redeemed, is not to be considered as God's general rule with regard to sinners. In fine, the good thief suffered much on the cross, and Christ might have received his patient sufferings there, as his purgatorial expiation.

SECTION III.

Q. What is your third mode of proving that there is a Purgatory?

A. By tradition, or the unanimous testimony of the Fathers.

Q. Was all antiquity of the belief that there is a Purgatory?

A. The third Council of Carthage, anno 253, decreed prayers for the dead. The Council of Chalons in 579, the Council of Worms in 829, and the council of Trent, all came to the same decision.

Q. Are the ancient Fathers unanimous on this question?

A. You have only to consult *Berrington and Kirk's Faith of Catholics*, or a little Work published by the compiler of this, to be satisfied that they are most unanimous. St Ephrem orders prayers for the repose of his soul after his death. The Emperor Constantine wished to be buried in a church, that the faithful might remember him in their prayers to God. St Chrysostom, Hom. 1 Ep. ad. Corinth., says: "The tears of the living are not useless to the dead; prayers and alms relieve them." St Jerom, in his Epistle to Pammachius, remarks: "It is customary to strow the graves of the female dead with flowers, but you have followed a better usage, in strowing the grave of your wife with alms for the solace of her soul." St Augustine, in his Confessions, lib. ix. c. 13, says: "I shed not a tear whilst they offered the holy sacrifice for the peace of my dear mother's soul." On the 37th Psalm, he prays thus: "Purify me, O Lord, in this life, that I may not require the application of that fire by which souls are tried, in the next;" and, in his Work on the Heresies (Heresy 53), he says: "Ærius was the first who dared to teach, that it was of no use to offer up prayers and sacrifices for the dead, and this doctrine of Ærius is the fifty-third Heresy."

Q. Does it follow, from the circumstance, that the ancient Church prayed for the dead, that there is a Purgatory?

A. Certainly; if the Church always prayed for the dead, she believed the dead were in a place where prayer could be beneficial to them: this place was not heaven, nor could it be hell, therefore it was Purgatory.

CHAPTER XXII.

ON BAPTISM.

SECTION I.

Q. How do you prove that there are seven sacraments ?

A. From the Holy Scripture, and the dogmatical decisions, as well as the constant traditions, of the Church.

Q. Where do you find in Scripture that there are seven sacraments ?

A. We find in Scripture seven outward signs of invisible grace, instituted by Jesus Christ, as so many means to confer grace on our souls ; this is easily shown of each sacrament in particular.

Q. Do all Catholics profess that there are seven sacraments ?

A. Yes ; all the Catholics in the world, in number about two hundred and fifty-six millions, believe in seven sacraments.

Q. Do the Greek schismatics recognise the same number ?

A. Yes ; all the Greek schismatics recognise the same number of sacraments as the Catholic Church, and these schismatics are in number about fifty-six and a-half millions ; so that three hundred and twelve millions and a half—that is, nearly the half of the whole human race—hold the Catholic faith on this subject ; whilst the whole Protestant population of the world, opposed to it, only amount to about forty-nine millions. Jeremias, the schismatical Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, declared the belief of the schismatical Greek Church in the seven sacraments, anno 1576 ; and others have repeated that declaration at various times since that period.

Q. What do you conclude from all this ?

A. That the whole Christian world, morally speaking, do now believe, and have at all times believed, in seven sacraments ; for had the seven sacraments been a modern invention, the Greek schismatical Church, which has been separated from us for nine hundred years, would not have had these sacraments, in number and nature, just as we have them.

Q. Have Protestants been always agreed as to the number of the sacraments ?

A. No ; some admitted two : baptism and what they call the Lord's Supper ; others admitted four, and even five ; and some admitted only three, as is evident from the Confession of Augsburg, Apol. art. 7, which says expressly that "penance is a sacrament in the proper sense of the word."

Q. What inference would a man of reflection draw from these Protestant inconsistencies?

A. That Protestants were compelled to frame their religion, not according to Holy Writ, but according to the corrupt maxims of their followers. The question with their founders was not, what does Christ teach? but, what will our partisans receive as doctrine from our hands? Hence, they taught one doctrine to-day and another to-morrow, one doctrine in this country, and another in that, in order to suit themselves and their religion to the changes of time, place, and passion.

SECTION II.

Q. For what end was baptism instituted?

A. To make us Christians; to free us from the slavery of Satan, under which we come into the world; to unite us with Jesus Christ as members of his body; to give us a right to receive all the other sacraments; and a title to an eternal and happy inheritance in heaven.

Q. Is baptism a true sacrament?

A. It is, because it has all the requisites of a true sacrament.

Q. What is the outward or visible sign in baptism?

A. The pouring of water on the person, and the words, "I baptize thee," &c., pronounced by the minister.

Q. What is the inward or invisible grace conferred?

A. The sanctifying grace of God, by which the soul is regenerated, cleansed from all sin, made the child of God, a member of his Church, and an heir of heaven.

Q. Where do you find, in Scripture, that Christ instituted baptism?

A. In many places, but particularly in the passage where he gives his commission to the Apostles, Matt. xxviii. 19; "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Q. Does it appear from Scripture that baptism remits sin?

A. Yes; St Peter, Acts ii. 38, says: "Do penance, and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins."

Q. Is baptism necessary to salvation?

A. Yes; for Christ says, John iii. 5: "Verily, verily, I say to thee, Except a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" and in Mark xvi.: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved."

Q. Do the Fathers of the early and pure Church teach infant baptism?

A. Most explicitly.. St Dionysius, of 2d century, says:

"It is a tradition of the Apostles, that infants should be baptized." (Eccel. Hierarch. c. ult.) Ireneus, of same age, says: "All are saved who are regenerated in Christ: infants, youths, and aged men." (Lib. ii. c. 39.)

Q. What says Origen? (lib. v. in cap. 6. ad. Rom.)

A. "The Church hath received a tradition from the Apostles, to give baptism also to little ones." St Cyprian, in the same age, says: "It seemed good, not only to him, but the whole Council, that little ones should be baptized even before the eighth day." (Lib. iii. Ep. ad Fidum.) See also Clement, Ep. 4; Epiph. Heres. 28; Augustine, de Orig. Anim.; Coun. Nicen. Decret 3 de Baptis.

Q. Can Protestants prove to Anabaptists, that the baptism of infants is good and useful?

A. No: they cannot; because, according to Protestant principles, such baptism is useless.

Q. Why do you say this?

A. One of the Protestant principles is, that no human being can be justified, except by an act of faith in Jesus Christ; but no infant is capable of making this act of faith; therefore, upon Protestant principles, the baptism of infants is useless.

Q. Can you draw the same consequence from any other principle?

A. Yes; their first principle is, that nothing is to be practised, which is not authorized by scriptural example; but it does not appear from Scripture, that even one infant was ever baptized; therefore Protestants should reject, on their own principle, infant baptism as an unscriptural usage.

Q. How do Anabaptists treat other Protestants?

A. They boast, that the Scripture is evidently for Anabaptist practice; that other Protestants hold traditional doctrines like the Catholics. They quote Matt. xxviii., "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them," from which they say it is clear, that *teaching* should go before baptism; hence, they conclude, that as infants cannot be taught, so neither should they be baptized, until they are capable of teaching or instruction.

Q. What use do they make of Mark xvi.: "He who believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved?"

A. They say it is evident, that belief, or faith, must precede baptism; but, they add, children or infants are not capable of believing; therefore neither are they capable of being baptized.

Q. What can Protestants reply to this Anabaptist reasoning?

A. They may give these passages another meaning, but they can never prove that their interpretation is better than that of the Anabaptists, because they themselves give every one a right to interpret Scripture.

Q. *What inference do you draw from this?*

A. That every Protestant has much reason to doubt whether he be baptized.

Q. *How do Catholics prove that infants ought to be baptized?*

A. Not from Scripture alone, which is not clear on this subject, but from the Scripture, illustrated by the constant tradition of the Church, which, in every age, administered baptism to infants, and consequently the practice must have been derived from the Apostles.

Q. *Can Protestants use this triumphant argument of tradition against the Anabaptists?*

A. No; they have no right to use it in this matter, where it would serve them, since they reject it in every question where it is opposed to their novel and lately invented doctrines.

CHAPTER XXIII.

ON CONFIRMATION.

Q. *Why do you consider Confirmation one of the sacraments?*

A. Because it is a visible sign of invisible grace.

Q. *What is the visible sign in Confirmation?*

A. The unction of Holy Chrism, and the imposition of the hands of the bishop.

Q. *What is the invisible grace conferred by this sacrament?*

A. A grace of the Holy Ghost, which strengthens and secures the faith of the Christian.

Q. *Where do you find Confirmation mentioned in Scripture?*

A. In Acts viii. it is said, that the Samaritans, having received the Word of God, were *baptized* by St Philip; and the Apostles "sent unto them Peter and John, who, when they were come, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost; for he was not as yet come upon any of them, but they were only baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then they laid their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost." Here we have a sacred rite performed by the Apostles themselves, by the imposition of hands, which certainly is not ordination, as some have

dreamed ; for, as is evident from a previous verse of the same chapter, there were women amongst those upon whom the Apostles imposed their hands. Neither can it be baptism ; for the text expressly says, that these Samaritans were previously baptized by St Philip. Therefore it is that sacrament of Confirmation, which, by the universal testimony of the whole Christian Church, was instituted by Christ, and practised, in this instance, by his Apostles.

Q. Have you any other scriptural proof showing this sacrament as completely distinct from baptism ?

A. Yes ; St Paul first baptized and then confirmed the Ephesians, Acts xix. 5 : “ Having heard these things, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus ; and when Paul had imposed his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came upon them.”

Q. May it not be said, that the Apostles imposed their hands on these occasions to communicate the external and visible gifts of the Holy Ghost, but that bishops have no such power now ?

A. The external or visible gifts of the Holy Spirit, such as the gift of tongues or prophecy, were, in the time of the Apostles, necessary for the conversion of the world, as direct proofs that God was the Author of their religion ; but now that the world has abundant arguments and proofs for that great fundamental truth, miracles are no longer necessary, but the grace of God—communicated along with these miraculous gifts, which strengthened the first Christians unto perfection, and enabled them to lay down, even with joy, their lives, rather than deny their faith—has been necessary in every age to all Christians, is still necessary, and will continue so until the end of the world ; and it is this invisible grace of the Holy Ghost which is communicated in Confirmation.

Q. What have you to say to Protestants on this sacrament ?

A. You appeal, we say to them, incessantly to Scripture,—you boast that you comply with it to the *very letter* : why is it, then, that only a mere handful of you practise this sacred rite ? Why do you not, as the Apostles did, impose your hands upon those whom you have baptized ?

Q. Are there any proofs for Confirmation in the practice of the ancient and pure Church ?

A. Yes ; St Cyril, 3 Cathes., says : “ When the body is visibly anointed, the soul becomes sanctified by the interior operation of the Holy Spirit.” St Augustine, Lit. contra Petel. lib. iii. cap. 10, says : “ The sacrament of Holy Chrism does not yield in sanctity to baptism itself.”

Q. Do other Fathers speak of this sacrament?

A. St Clement, of 2^d century, says: "All must make haste to be consigned" (confirmed) "by a bishop; that is, to receive the sevenfold grace of the Holy Ghost." (Ep. ad. Julium.)

Q. What says Dionysius? (Eccl. Hier. c. 4.)

A. "But the anointing with ointment gives also the coming of the Holy Ghost to them that are consecrated."

Q. What says Tertullian? (De Resurrect. Carnis.)

A. "The flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is overshadowed with the imposition of hands, that the soul may be illuminated with the Spirit of God."

Q. Is it not a strange infatuation in Presbyterians, to reject a sacrament, so clearly laid down in Scripture?

A. Yes; very strange; but this is not a solitary instance of such infatuation. They read the Scripture, not to follow or obey it as a rule, but to adopt or reject its doctrines at the bidding of fancy or fashion. By the rejection of bishops, who are the ordinary ministers of this sacrament, they made it almost a matter of necessity to reject the sacrament.

Q. What think you of the Episcopalian practice?

A. It is more absurd than the Presbyterian, since the former have rejected the substance and retained the shadow. If it be not a sacrament, it is only a ceremony; and as they profess to detest ceremonies, they should abandon it altogether.

CHAPTER XXIV.

ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

SECTION I.

Q. Is the Holy Eucharist a sacrament?

A. Yes; all parties admit this, even those who look upon it as merely bread and wine.

Q. What is the sensible sign in this sacrament?

A. The appearance of bread and wine which remain after consecration, and under which our Blessed Saviour is received into our souls.

Q. What is the inward grace contained in this sacrament?

A. The body and blood of Jesus Christ, the source and author of all grace.

you find Jesus Christ mentioned as the author?

ospel account of its institution, Luke xxii. 19, Christ, "taking bread, gave thanks, and brake, and gave them, saying, THIS IS MY BODY; do this for a remembrance of me. In like manner, the chalice also, after supper, saying, This is the chalice of the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you."

What does the Catholic Church believe as to this?

That, after the words of consecration are pronounced over the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the outward appearance of bread and wine,—the whole substance of the bread being changed into his body, and the whole substance of the wine into his blood; we understand also, not his body and blood as they were in this world, but as they are now glorious and immortal in heaven.

Q. What do you mean by a glorious and immortal body?

A. I mean that kind of body of which Paul speaks, 1 Cor. xv. 44: "It is sown a natural body, it shall rise a spiritual body; if there be a natural body, there is also a spiritual body."

Q. Do the Greeks hold the same doctrine as the Catholics on this subject?

A. Yes; in their attestation, signed by seven Eastern Archbishops (Perpet. de la Foi. tom. iii. p. 412), we read; "1st, That the living body of Jesus Christ, who was crucified, who ascended into heaven, and who sits at the right hand of the Father, IS TRULY PRESENT in the Eucharist, but in an invisible manner; 2dly, that the bread and wine, after the invocation of the priest and the consecration, are *substantially changed* into the true body and blood of Jesus Christ, and that the accidents which remain are not bread and wine in reality, although they appear to be bread and wine; 3dly, that the Eucharist is a sacrifice for the living and the dead, established by Jesus Christ, and which we have from the Apostles by tradition; 4thly, that the body of Jesus Christ is eaten whole and entire, in an impassible state, by those who receive it, whether they be worthy or unworthy,—such as are worthy receive it for their salvation, the unworthy to their condemnation; that it is also immolated without effusion of blood, and justly adored as God."

Q. Was not the celebrated Calvinist, Claude, staggered by this Eastern document?

A. So much so, that he wrote to verify have the celebrated letter in answer to him, 1672, confirming every word of the above declaration in the clearest and strongest language, as containing the doctrine of the Eastern Church on the subject of the Eucharist, de la Foi, already quoted, tom. iii.

Q. *What did Luther teach on this subject?*

A. "In vain I wished," he says, "to have denied the presence of Christ in the Eucharist,...the words of institution are so plain and strong in favour of the mystery, in spite of all my wishes, although I strained every nerve to reject it, yet I could never bring my mind to adopt the denial as expedient." (Ep. Car. Amic.) Again he says: "The denial of the real presence is a piece of downright blasphemy, an impeachment of the divine veracity; and he calls the deniers, "a set of deviled, be-deviled, per-deviled, and super-deviled wretches."

Q. *What is the real doctrine of the Church of England on this sacrament?*

A. In the Book of Common Prayer, we find the following question: "What is the inward part or thing signified?" (of the Lord's Supper.) The answer is: "The body and blood of Christ, which are *verily* and *indeed* taken, and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

Q. *What says Leibnitz?* (Systema Theol. p. 226: Paris, 1819.)

A. "But pious antiquity plainly enough declared, that the bread was changed into the body of Christ, the wine into his blood;...and this change the Latins have rightly called transubstantiation;...here the Scripture is to be explained by that tradition, which the Church, as its keeper, has transmitted to us."

Q. *What says Grotius?* (Vot. pro. pace.)

A. "I find in all the Liturgies—Greek, Latin, Arabic, Syriac, and others—prayers addressed to God, that, by his Holy Spirit, he would consecrate the gifts offered up, and make them the body of his Son. I was therefore right in asserting, that a practice so ancient and universal must be considered as having come down from the first ages, and ought not to have been altered."

Q. *What says Dr Parker, Prot. Bishop of Oxford?* (Reasons for Abrogating the Test, p. 13, 1688.)

A. "It is evident to all men that are but ordinarily conversant in ecclesiastical learning, that the ancient Fathers, from age to age, asserted the real and substantial presence

in very high and expressive terms." Indeed, almost all the *learned bishops* of the English Protestant Church are of the same opinion on this matter. And no one can doubt, that a vast section of that Church at present are as much Catholic, as the Catholics themselves, on the subject of the real presence.

Q. *What inference do you draw from this powerful testimony in favour of the real presence?*

A. That this portion of Catholic doctrine has the support of every Church deserving the name; that its opponents are few, generally ignorant, and always factious and full of sectarian prejudice. Hence, from the number and learning of the vouchers for the Catholic faith here under discussion, it is manifest, that that faith must be strongly and clearly laid down in Scripture.

SECTION II.

Q. *Did Christ make any particular promise, as regards the Eucharist, before he instituted it?*

A. Yes; a very clear promise, in St John's Gospel, chap vi.

Q. *Does this chapter regard the Eucharist?*

A. Yes; even the learned Mr Johnston, a Protestant, in his "Unbloody Sacrifice," shows, at large, that the primitive Fathers understood this chapter as referring to the Eucharist.

Q. *Is there any thing remarkable in the first part of this chapter?*

A. Yes; the astonishing miracle which Christ performed in feeding five thousand persons, with only five loaves and two fishes, is here related; and such a miracle was truly a suitable prelude to the introduction of that miracle of miracles—the Holy Eucharist, by which he was, with heavenly bread—that is, with his own body and blood—to feed all his faithful followers. The very fact, that he wrought this astonishing miracle, before introducing the subject of the Eucharist, shows that he was about to speak on a matter that required strong faith in his followers and audience. If he had merely to announce to them, that he was going to give them common bread and wine, is it likely he would have introduced it by such a tremendous miracle?

Q. *Does it appear that the Jews had, before the teaching of Christ, any notion that the Messiah would give them bread from heaven, as Moses had done?*

A. Yes; for in one of their earliest works after the coming of Christ, "Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes," they say, that as Moses brought down manna from heaven, so one of the signs of the Messiah should be, that he should bring

down bread from heaven. Various Jewish teachers in the early ages of Christianity, according to R. David Kimchi, seem to have admitted transubstantiation, grounding it on that passage of Osee xiv. 8: "And they shall live upon wheat, and they shall blossom as a vine: his memorial shall be as the vine of Lebanon." "Many doctors," says David Kimchi, "expound this text, that there shall be made a CHANGE OF NATURE IN WHEAT in the times of our Redeemer Christ."

Q. Does Christ himself appear to allude to this belief of the Jews?

A. Yes, in very clear terms, John vi. 32: "Amen, amen, I say to you, Moses gave you not bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven."

Q. What does Christ say that this bread from heaven is?

A. In verse 35, he says, it is *himself*: "I AM THE BREAD OF LIFE."

Q. What follows these astonishing words?

A. A long and impressive instruction as to the necessity of believing his words, which shows clearly, that he was about to reveal something, which he knew his audience would have great difficulty in believing.

Q. After ending the instruction as to faith with these impressive words,—Amen, amen, I say to you, he that believeth in me hath everlasting life,—how does he proceed?

A. He repeats again, verse 48, the awful words, "I am the bread of life," as if he saw they would now be believed, in consequence of the instruction he had given.

Q. Does he show that the bread which he will give shall be better than the miraculous manna, and, consequently, better than the bread and wine of the Protestant sacrament?

A. Yes; he says: "Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and are dead; this is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that if any man eat of it, he may not die."

SECTION III.

Q. After having prepared the minds of his audience by feeding five thousand persons with five loaves, and lectured them on the necessity of strong and lively faith,—after having repeated, again, that he himself was the bread of life, from heaven,—what does he now say, that this bread is, in reality?

A. Verse 52, he says, "The bread that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world."

Q. How did the Jews receive this announcement?

A. Verse 53: "They strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" This is exactly

the question put, at the present day, by unbelieving Protestants. How?!! What blasphemy, to put such a question to the Almighty! *How* did he create the world out of nothing? *How* did he turn the rod of Moses into a serpent? *How* did he change the waters into blood? *How*, the water into wine at Cana? *How* feed five thousand people with five loaves?

Q. *If he had meant, that what he was to give them was mere bread and mere wine, what should he, as a good and wise God, have done, now that he saw the Jews did not believe him?*

A. He should at once have explained (as he did on other occasions), that he did not wish to be understood literally but figuratively,—that he meant to give them bread and wine, merely as a commemoration of his death.

Q. *Did he give such an explanation?*

A. No; he repeats, verse 54, the same truth again in stronger language, and even with an asseveration: "Then Jesus said to them, Amen, amen, I say unto you, Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you;" and, in the next five verses, in order to give strength to his words, and to leave no doubt of his meaning, on the mind of any one, he, in different forms, but almost in the same words, repeats and re-repeats the same truth, without any explanation whatever.

Q. *When, on other occasions, Christ taught any thing in figurative language, was he in the habit of giving an explanation immediately after, lest his words might be misunderstood, and lest the people might be misled by his figurative language, by interpreting his words literally?*

A. Most certainly he was. In John iii., he corrects Nicodemus, who understood him literally, when he wished to be understood figuratively. In Matt. xvi. 5, he corrects the Apostles, who understood him literally, when he meant to speak figuratively, on the *leaven of the Pharisees*. In John iv. 32, his disciples misunderstood him as to the *food* he spoke of, taking him in the literal sense; he instantly corrects the error, by explaining himself. In John xi. 11, his disciples again mistake him, and he instantly explains. In Matt. xix., there is another misunderstanding on the part of his disciples, and he at once sets them right. Another instance may be seen in Matt. viii.

Q. *Did the Jews, the Apostles, and the disciples of Jesus, understand him here in the literal sense?*

A. Yes; for the Jews ask, "*How can this man give us his flesh to eat?*", Ver. 62: "*His disciples murmured.*" Ver.

67 : "*After this many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him ;*" whilst he finds it necessary, in ver. 68, to ask his Apostles, "*Will you also go ?*"

Q. Seeing, then, that all are about to leave him,—that they are scandalised at his doctrine,—that they do not believe him in the literal sense,—does he on this, as on every other occasion, explain himself at once, and show them that he speaks in figures,—that he does not intend to give them his flesh and his blood in reality, but merely bread and wine, as a commemoration of himself?

A. No; he sees that the Jews, the disciples, and the twelve Apostles, understand him in the very sense which he intended. He allows them to go away; he gives no explanation, because he has none to give. They understand him literally, and he speaks literally. He appeals to his Ascension, as an argument which should induce them to believe (ver. 63.) In ver. 64, he clearly tells them that the eating of dead flesh will profit them nothing, but that the flesh which he will give them is his glorified body, animated by his soul and his life-giving divinity,—that same body, soul, and divinity, by which in the mystery of Redemption, he was to give life to the world. He exhorts them again to have faith, showing that he was teaching something which it was difficult to believe; and concludes, by asking his Apostles, whether they also refuse to believe him. To which St Peter replies (ver. 69), with full confidence in his Divine Master: "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life.... Thou art Christ the Son of God."

Q. What general inference would you draw from the conduct of those to whom Christ addressed himself on this occasion?

A. If Christ intended only to give bread and wine, as a memorial of himself, why did he not say so, to prevent the departure of his followers, and to teach them truth? Or can any one in his senses suppose, that the Author of truth would leave, in doubt and obscurity, one of the most important articles of the religion he was about to establish? Assuredly no. Then he spoke in the literal sense,—then he wished to be understood in the literal sense,—then the Jews, the disciples, and the Apostles, understood him correctly. The Jews and disciples left him, because they would not believe that he could give them his flesh and blood. But the Apostles, who knew that he was God, to whom nothing was impossible, who could not be deceived himself, and could not deceive them, submitted to the belief of the incomprehensible mystery, in these words: "Lord, to whom shall we go? thou

hast the words of eternal life;" we believe all that thou hast taught, *no matter how difficult*, BECAUSE "we have believed, and have known, THAT THOU ART THE CHRIST THE SON OF GOD."

Q. *If Christ intended to be understood in the figurative sense, and meant only to give bread and wine, would there have been any reason why all his audience should have turned their backs upon him?*

A. Certainly not; since such memorial would have been inferior both to the manna and the paschal lamb of the Old Law.

Q. *If Christ intended only mere bread and wine, was it not an awful violation of the propriety of language to say, that, in using these, his followers would be eating his flesh and drinking his blood?*

A. Yes, most certainly; such as we can never suppose that the wisdom of God could adopt; nay more, such language was well calculated to deter the Jews from believing his doctrine at all, because, in their language, to *eat the flesh* of any one, meant to do him some grievous injury, Ps. xxviii.; Job xix.; Eccl. iv.; St James v. As to the drinking of blood, it was universally considered a dreadful crime among the Jews, Gen. ix.; Levit. vii. Sam. xiv.; Judith xi. And as to the eating of human flesh, or drinking human blood, it is mentioned, as the most dreadful curse God could inflict on mankind, Wisd. xi. 7; Apoc. xvi. 6; Jerem. xix. 8.

Q. *What would you draw from this consideration?*

A. That Christ evidently wished to be understood in the literal sense, and, on account of this, was compelled to use language disagreeable to Jewish ears; otherwise, his use of such expressions was uncalled for, improper, and unwise, and calculated to defeat the very object which our Divine Saviour had in view; and this supposition, that the very *Author of wisdom*, would couch the doctrines he wished the entire world to believe, in language unpardonably incorrect, and scandalous to his followers, is not only absurd—it is impious and blasphemous.

SECTION IV.

Q. *Christ then promised that he would give his body and blood, for the spiritual food of his people, where do you find that promise fulfilled?*

A. In Luke xxii. 19: "And taking bread, he gave thanks, and brake, and gave to them, saying: *This is my body which is given for you.*" Place these words alongside of the words of the promise, and you will at once admit the promise ful-

filled. The words of the promise were: "And the bread that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world."

Q. *Is the institution as to the cup, or chalice, equally clear?*

A. Yes; the words of the promise were: "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and *drink his blood*, you shall not have life in you." This promise is now fulfilled in these words, Luke xxii. 20: "This is the chalice of the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you."

Q. *Are the Evangelists Matthew xxvi. 26, 28, and Mark xiv. 22, 24, equally clear?*

A. Yes; and the fact that they relate the institution almost in the very same words, and essentially in the very same sense,—that they all repeat the words *body* and *blood* with the most remarkable uniformity of language, is one of the strongest proofs for the real presence.

Q. *Why so?*

A. Because they, at least, knew what Christ meant by the words *body* and *blood*; and if Christ meant by these, merely *bread* and *wine*, some of them, were it only by accident, would have given his *meaning* instead of his words, or, at all events, would have given some explanation of them; yet not one of them did so.

Q. *Is there any thing remarkable in the Syriac version of St Mark?*

A. Yes; learned Catholics, as well as Protestants, admit, that it represents our Lord as saying: "*Take, eat, this is my body ITSELF*;" thus clearly confirming the Catholic interpretation. See Walton, Prol. Bib. Polygl.

Q. *If Christ intended to deliver to mankind, his real body and blood, could he have used more proper, concise, or correct language?*

A. No; we cannot conceive language better chosen.

Q. *If he intended mere bread and wine, could he have used more improper language?*

A. No; in that case, the use of such language would be unwise and inexplicable.

Q. *Was the time in which Christ instituted the sacrament a period of his mortal career, in which the use of the most obscure and improper figures should be employed, to convey to his Apostles (those who were to teach the world) the most simple and necessary truths?*

A. Certainly not; he was making his *last Testament*, which, even amongst men, is made in as simple and clear language as possible; he was teaching his Apostles what they were to teach others; he was teaching what was to be believed and

practised by the whole world till the latest ages, and upon the belief and practice of which, all were to be saved or damned. The awfulness of the time, therefore, the awful nature of the doctrine, and its awful importance to those who were to teach, as well as to those who should be taught, all demanded from a good and wise God, what he could easily give, and what he most assuredly did give—the utmost perspicuity in the language used.

Q. *Is there any thing remarkable in the words of the old alliance, which tends to illustrate these words of the new: "This is my blood?"*

A. Yes; in Exodus xxiv., Moses took blood, and sprinkled it upon the people, saying: "*This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you.*" The words of Christ in the New Testament have evidently a relation to those of Moses in the Old; and as Moses presented to the people, in the Old Law, the *real blood* of the victims, so, in the New, the *real blood* of the heavenly victim—the Lamb of God—is presented to the children of the new covenant.

Q. *If, in this most dignified of all the sacraments, the true body and blood of Christ were not present, what would be the consequence?*

A. That Jesus Christ, the *all-wise God and Saviour* of mankind, did intentionally, or, at least, indifferent as to the awful consequences, express himself so in its institution, as to deceive nineteen-twentieths of those he came to *redeem*,—to involve all Christians in bitter and endless disputes, and expose the great body of his Church to be guilty of the appalling crime of idolatry; all this, too, whilst one word of explanation from him would have prevented all these evils.

Q. *What would you infer from this?*

A. That, as these blasphemous suppositions cannot for a moment be entertained, so it is clear, beyond all doubt, that Christ spoke in the *literal* sense; in *that* he intended to be understood; and in that sense, and no other, his language is perfectly intelligible.

Q. *Was the Almighty pleased to be explicit in the language which he employed in the establishment of other institutions of importance?*

A. To be satisfied that he was so in institutions of much less importance, read Gen. xvii. 10, on circumcision; Exod. xii. 3, on the sacrifice of the paschal lamb; and Leviticus, on general ritual observance: and in the New Law, the sacrament of baptism is instituted and enforced, in language the most clear and precise.

Q. *If Christ meant to leave us in the sacrament mere bread and wine, are not his words sufficiently explicit?*

A. No; they are the reverse. He says: "*This is my body, this is my blood;*" whilst Protestants would make him mean by these words: This is NOT my body, this is NOT my blood.

SECTION V.

Q. *Can you quote any other scriptural authority on the subject?*

A. Yes; several, and of great importance. St Paul, 1 Cor. x. 16, says: "The chalice of *benediction* which we bless, is it not the *communion of the blood of Christ*? And the bread which we break, is it not the *partaking of the body of the Lord*?"

Q. *What is the first remark you would make on this passage?*

A. St Paul knew well whether the sacrament was the body and blood of Christ, or only mere bread and wine. He is here preaching to the Christian Corinthians, instructing them in what they ought to believe and practise. If, then, Christ spoke figuratively, why does not St Paul now explain these figures to the simple and the unlettered? Why does he now, when he ought to be plain and clear, call bread, *the body*, and wine, *the blood of Christ*? If the Protestant be the true sense of these words, why does he not, *even by accident*, hint at such a meaning?

Q. *Have you any other reflection to offer on St Paul's words?*

A. If the cup contain *only wine*, how can St Paul call it a cup of *benediction or blessing*? If only wine, how can the reception of it be the *communion of the blood of Christ*? If what appears bread, be *only bread*, how can the partaking of it be the partaking of the *body of the Lord*? Besides, the word which St Paul uses to express communion, is *κοινωνία*, not *μίστηρις*,—a word which expresses not any ordinary union, but the closest union of what we receive with our own substance.

Q. *What does St. Paul say in the next verse? (1 Cor. x. 17.)*

A. After having said, that we are, partakers of the body and blood of Christ, under the forms of bread and wine, he now adds: "For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread." Now, in the Catholic sense of the sacrament, these words are true strictly, for we all partake of **ONE AND THE SAME BREAD**,—that is, the sacred flesh of the Lord. The *bread* which I will give, is my *flesh*; but, in the Protestant sense, St Paul's words would be non-sense; for if the sacrament be mere bread, then each receiver partakes of a different bread; and hence, as the

bread upon which they feed is not one, so neither can they be cemented into one body. Protestants, therefore, being neither *one bread*, nor *one body*, are not the sort of Christians to whom St Paul addressed himself.

Q. *What does St Paul say in the next verse of same chapter?*

A. "Are not they that eat of the sacrifice, partakers of the altar?"

Q. *What does St Paul mean by these words?*

A. That as the Jews, by the order of the Almighty, always, except when precluded by their sins, eat of the victims that were offered, so also the Christians, by partaking of the altar, eat of the sacrifice; but the Christian sacrifice is Christ himself; therefore, in partaking of the victim, they eat the body and drink the blood of Christ.

Q. *Have you any other scriptural argument?*

A. On this all-important matter, the arguments from Scripture seem inexhaustible. St Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24, records the institution in the very language adopted by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and adds, that he has learned what he writes from *the Lord*. Now, if Christ had spoken in figures, at the institution, would it not be natural to expect, that, in this new revelation to St Paul, who was not present at the Last Supper, he should vary the language, so as to afford some explanation of these figures? And yet he does not; the same words are adhered to, with the most wonderful exactness. Again, St Paul knew the true meaning of these words; and if he understood them to mean mere bread and wine, used as a figure or commemoration, why did he not, writing, as he was, in *Greek*, to the Corinthians, say, This is a *figure of my body*, or a commemoration of my blood, or this SIGNIFIES *my body and my blood*? St Paul was instructing the ignorant; he tells these ignorant people, that what they believe to be bread and wine, is the body and blood of Christ: was this the way an inspired Apostle should instruct the simple? Would any Protestant minister imitate St Paul in this odd system of instruction?

Q. *Does St Paul give any explanation, which proves, uncontestedly, that he understood the sacrament, to be the true body and blood of Christ?*

A. Yes; in ver. 27, he says: "Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord."

Q. *What inferences do you draw from these words?*

A. That St Paul believed in the real presence; for how could he call the chalice, *the chalice of the Lord*, if it were only a cup containing common wine? And what would the un-

worthiness consist in, if only common bread and wine were present? And how could the unworthy receiver be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, if the body and blood of the Lord were not there present?

Q. *What do you remark on the following verse:* "But let a man prove himself; and so let a man eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice?"

A. That, in the sacrament, there must be something more than mere bread; otherwise, why this searching proof and trial before receiving it?

Q. *What are the concluding words of St Paul, ver. 29?*

A. "For he that eateth or drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord."

Q. *What do you say on these words?*

A. How could a man become unworthy by eating a morsel of bread, and drinking a little wine, as a commemoration of the death of Christ? Why, above all, is he consigned to eternal damnation for a thing, in itself, so indifferent?—and why is he doomed to this awful fate, for not discerning the body of the Lord, if the body of the Lord be not there, since, if not there, it cannot be insulted or profaned? If the Catholic be the true doctrine,—if the body and blood of Christ are truly and really present,—then are all St Paul's words intelligible and full of meaning; but in the Protestant sense, they are the most unintelligible gibberish that ever was uttered.

Q. *Can you draw any further proof of this from the next verse? (30.)*—"Therefore are there many infirm and weak among you, and many sleep."

A. Yes, and a very strong proof. St Paul, in these words, says: On account of your unworthy communions; because you, in many instances, receive, without discerning the body of the Lord; you are afflicted with sickness, and even with death, in punishment of your awful guilt, by the profanation of the sacred body and blood of the Redeemer,—a punishment which we cannot suppose inflicted for eating bread or drinking mere wine.

Q. *Are the Christian Church and dispensation superior to those of the Old Law?*

A. Certainly; this is admitted on all hands, by Protestants as well as Catholics.

Q. *Would this be the case, if the most dignified sacrament of the New Law were only bread and wine, used as a mere figure of the Christian sacrifice?*

A. Assuredly not; for how much more dignified, and strikingly illustrative of the sufferings and death of our beloved Saviour, was the paschal lamb of the Jews, slain and offered up before the Lord, than is the unmeaning practice of eating and drinking bread and wine, as the only memorial of the Christian Pasch.

Q. *Was the manna of the desert a figure of the Christian sacrament of the Eucharist?*

A. Yes; Christ himself declares it; but if the Protestant bread and wine be the Christian Pasch, then the figure is greater than the reality, and Christianity is degraded even below the level of the Judaic rite. The manna was miraculous bread; the Protestant sacrament is natural bread. The manna came from on high; the Protestant sacrament comes from the earth, or the baker's oven. The manna was a heavenly food, given only to the people of God; the Protestant sacrament is the common food of all men, wicked and virtuous, Jews and Gentiles, Turks and Christians. The manna, on the Sabbath, suffered not corruption; the Protestant sacrament is corruptible at all times; it has no miraculous qualities. The manna had the taste of all kinds of food, and yet was none of all these foods; the Protestant sacrament has the taste of ordinary bread, and has no heavenly property whatever. Thus, according to the Protestant faith, Christianity sinks into insignificance before the wonders of Judaism—the figure is greater than the reality—Moses superior to Christ—all our notions of religion are subverted—we find ourselves entangled in a horrid mass of absurdities and contradiction. But when we look at the Catholic Pasch, and believe in the illustrious sacrifice and sacrament in which the body and blood of Jesus Christ are offered and received, we are extricated from our inexplicable difficulties; our understanding becomes unclouded; we perceive at once the noble and significant figure of the Old, and the infinitely superior and illustrious reality of the New Law.

SECTION VI.

Q. *Does not Dr Adam Clarke, in "Discourse on the Holy Eucharist," London, 1808, say, that in the Syriac, the language used by Christ, there is no word that expresses "to signify or represent," and that hence Christ was compelled to say, "This IS my body," instead of "This REPRESENTS my body?"*

A. Yes; but this assertion of Dr Clarke has been expunged since, by Mr Horne, thus proving that Clarke was wrong. Dr Lee of Cambridge (Proleg. to Bagster's Polygl.

Bible) confesses that Clarke was in error; and the Right Rev. Dr Wiseman, who is well qualified to judge in this matter, has discovered, in the Syriac, many words expressing to *signify*, to *represent*, or *typify*. But the simplest answer to the objection is, that the Apostles, who wrote in *Greek*, had plenty of words meaning to *signify*. Why then did they use the word *is*, when, to express Protestant doctrine, if they wished to teach such, they had an abundant choice of words?

Q. *Does not St Luke xxii. say: "And having taken the chalice, he gave thanks, and said, Take, and divide it among you. For I say to you, that I will not drink of the vine till the kingdom of God come?" And does not this prove that it was wine, and not his blood, which was in the chalice?*

A. If Protestants would have patience to read the whole passage, and not leap at conclusions, they would see that the above words were uttered, not over the sacramental cup, but over the wine that was drunk with the paschal lamb, immediately before Christ instituted the sacrament, in ver. 19, 20.

Q. *Christ says, "This is the chalice, the new testament," &c.; and where we have these two figures, why may not the whole be figurative?*

A. These figures were the simplest language to the Apostles who were familiar with them. Every one says, this cup, this glass, meaning the contents of it; and the Apostles were accustomed to the language of Moses: "This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord had made with you," meaning that the blood was not *of the covenant*, but its seal. Besides, Christ explains the figure in the words, "which shall be shed for you;" now, assuredly, it was not the chalice or wine that was shed, but his blood.

Q. *St Paul, 1 Cor. xi., says: "Do this for the commemoration, or, in remembrance, of me." Now, we do not remember things present, but things absent; hence Christ is not present in the sacrament?*

A. This is a mere quibble. Eccles. xii. says: "Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth." Now, will any Protestant be fool enough to say, that, in the days of our youth, our Creator is absent from us? Besides, Christ is not *visibly* present as he was, when addressing the Apostles; hence, *inasmuch* as he is now *invisible*, he may be said to be *absent*. In fine, the sacrament is a memorial of his death; and the real death of Jesus is not a thing *present* in the Holy Eucharist, but is only represented in it, 1 Cor. xi.: "As

often as you eat this bread, &c., you shall *show the death of the Lord* till he come."

Q. *Can a thing be a memorial of itself?*

A. Yes; the manna preserved in the Ark was so; Aaron's rod was preserved as a memorial of itself, with which Moses wrought so many miracles; the victims eaten by the Israelites were memorials of the same victims offered on the altar.

Q. *May not these words, "This is my body," &c. be understood as these others, "I am the door," "I am the vine?"*

A. No, for many reasons. 1st, Nothing was previously said by Christ to prepare the Apostles for believing that he was really to become a vine or a door; whilst he wrought a tremendous miracle, and addressed them in a long discourse, to prepare them to believe that the bread he was to give them, should be his own flesh. 2dly, When Christ, says, "*I am the door*," John x., the Scripture itself, ver. 6, declares, that he was speaking figuratively. "This PROVERB Jesus spoke to them, *but they understood not.*" Christ, seeing this, immediately explains the figure: "*I am the door into the sheep-fold; by my doctrine, and through my blood, all must enter. If any man enter in, he shall be saved. I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his life for his sheep.*" In John xv., where he says, he is the vine, he explains himself instantly, by calling us the *branches*; showing, that we must live by *his* grace, as the vine branch lives by the sap of the vine,—that we must be united to him by love and obedience, as he was by these united to his Father. Now, when Christ says, "*This is my body*," he does not even hint that he is speaking figuratively; he enters into no explanation whatever. The Jews are scandalised—his disciples leave him—all exclaim, "*This is a hard saying*;" yet he repeats the same truth in the same words: "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you."

Q. *May not Jesus Christ, when he said, "This is my body," have spoken figuratively, like St Paul, when he said, 1 Cor. x. "and the rock was Christ?"*

A. No; for St Paul is merely preaching, where figures are allowed and useful; whilst Christ is instituting a sacrament, at the most awful moment of his life, in the act of making his last will and testament; and every one will grant, that here rhetorical figures and flowers would be highly unbecoming. Besides, there is no figure in the words of St Paul, if carefully examined. He proposes the cloud and the passage of the Red Sea as a figure of baptism; the manna as

a figure of the body, and the water of the Rock of Horeb as a figure of the blood of Christ. He then says: "And all drank the same *spiritual* drink; they drank of the *spiritual rock* that followed them, and the rock (spiritual) was Christ." And was not Christ the *true spiritual* rock, from whose wounds, as from spiritual fountains, all believers, both prospectively and retrospectively, drank (not as the Jews, from the material and figurative rock Horeb) the spiritual waters of eternal life? The word *spiritual* explains the whole, and does away with the figure.

Q. *May not the substantive verb is, in the text, "This is my body," mean represents, as the same verb is means represents in Exodus xii.: "You shall eat (the flesh of the lamb) in haste, for it is the Phase (or Passover) of the Lord."*

A. No, not at all; though on the force of this text Zwinglius became so bold as to deny transubstantiation, declaring, that he was in a dream reminded of this text by some "*white or black monitor*." The fact is, that the verb *is* does not mean *represent* in this passage. Even Rosenmüller, *one of the most learned Protestant commentators*, maintains that the word *is* should be here taken literally; the original has, This is the passover to the Lord, or, this is the day or feast day of the passover sacred to the Lord. The very same construction of language is used in Exodus x.; "This is the Sabbath to the Lord," which we have, "This is the Sabbath of the Lord." The same again occurs in Exodus xxxii. 5: "The festival of the Lord," for "the festival to the Lord." And, finally, in the 27th verse of the very chapter under discussion: "This is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover,"—that is, in the original: "This is the sacrifice of the passover sacred to the Lord." So that the verb *is* does not here mean *represent* at all, but is to be understood literally. How amusingly inconsecutive are Protestants in their arguments against Catholicism. In a few scriptural instances, the verb *to be* means *to represent*, whilst in ten thousand instances, it is to be understood literally; therefore, like true philosophers, they conclude, because it suits their views, that in these words, "This is my body," the word *is* must be understood, not literally, but figuratively, whilst every circumstance connected with the above text goes to prove the contrary.

Q. *Do not the Scriptures represent the body of Christ as in heaven, which he is not to quit, till the "times of the restitution of all things,"—that is, until the end of the world?*

A. Yes; but the Scriptures assure us, that his body is also in the Eucharist; therefore we believe both. Those who

make this objection will find, that our Lord, *after his Ascension*, appeared visibly to St Paul in the castle of Jerusalem.

Q. *Does not Christ himself say, Mark xiv. : "The poor you have always with you, but me ye have not always?"*

A. Yes ; but he speaks here of his mortal and visible presence ; for he elsewhere says : " I will be with you all days, even to the end."

Q. *St Paul calls the sacrament bread, 1 Cor. xi. ; therefore is it bread ?*

A. He calls it bread, because it has the *appearance* of bread ; but he calls it *THIS bread*, clearly showing, that it has something extraordinary about it. He calls it bread, but he says that he who partakes of it, partakes of the *body of Christ*. Christ called it bread ; but he adds, the bread which I will give you is *my flesh* for the life of the world. Again, we have many examples of Scripture, in which the thing changed bears the name of that from which it is transubstantiated. Thus, Gen. ii., Eve is called the *bone* of Adam ; in Gen. iii., Adam is called *dust*, because he is made from *dust* ; Exodus vii., Aaron's rod is called a *rod*, after it became a serpent ; John ii., the *water*, after being changed into wine, is called *water*. The Scripture, too, often calls things what they *appear* to be. Thus Gen. xvii., *angels*, in human form, are called *men*.

SECTION VII.

Q. *What do you mean by transubstantiation ?*

A. To comprehend this, we must observe, that in all bodies there are two things to be noted : 1st, the *outward appearances*, such as taste, smell, shape, colour, &c. ; and 2dly, the matter or substance in which these qualities reside. The sensible qualities are objects of knowledge, which we can acquire by the testimony of the senses ; but we can form no notion of the nature or structure of the inward substance, —it is beyond the reach of even our conception. Now, with regard to the Holy Eucharist, our faith teaches us, that "*this inward imperceptible substance* of the bread and wine, is, at the consecration, by the almighty power of God, changed into the substance of the body and blood of Christ," all the *outward sensible qualities* remaining entirely the same as before consecration. (Council of Trent, Sess. xiii. cap. 4.)

Q. *Can you show that such a change took place ?*

A. Yes ; for when Christ took the bread into his hands, it was still bread ; but when he gave it to his disciples, he declares that it is his body : "*This is my body.*" His words

cannot be false ; by declaring it to be his body, he made it so. The change did not take place in the outward *sensible qualities* ; therefore it took place in the *inward substance*.

Q. *May it not be said that his body is with the bread ?*

A. No ; for Christ does not say : *In this bread, or with this bread, or under this bread, or in this bread eaten by faith, or with this bread when you receive it, is my body* ; but he simply says, **THIS IS MY BODY**. What Christ held in his hand could not be *bread* and his *body* at one and the same time.

Q. *Does the Scripture, by any other example than this, show, that the word of Christ, affirming that a thing is what it was not before, is sufficient to produce the effect ?*

A. Yes ; the ruler, John iv. 49, says to Christ : " Sir, come down before my son die. Jesus saith to him : Go thy way, thy son liveth ; and it was the same hour that Jesus said to the ruler, thy son liveth, that the fever left him." (Ver. 53.)

Q. *How is such a change possible ?*

A. You may as well ask, how was the world created out of *nothing* ; how were the waters of Egypt turned into blood ; the dry rod into a living serpent ; the water into wine at Cana ?

Q. *How can one substance exist under the outward appearance of another ?*

A. As easily as angels appeared to God's servants in the Old Law, under the outward appearance of men, and spoke, and walked, and atc, as if they really were men. Luke iii. 22, the Holy Ghost appeared under the *bodily shape of a dove* ; and, Acts ii. 3, under the form of "*parted tongues of fire*."

Q. *How can the body of Christ be in many places at one and the same time ?*

A. We know little of glorified bodies or their qualities and perfections ; but we know that they are not like mortal bodies. How did our Saviour's body pass through the stone with which his sepulchre was closed ? Mark xv. 46. How did his body pass through the door ? John xx. 19, 26. How did he, whilst in heaven, after his Ascension, appear to St Paul ? 1 Cor. xv. In fine, if, by the power of God, the same body cannot be in many places at once, how did Christ, Mark vi. 49, feed five thousand men with five loaves and two fishes, and four thousand, with seven loaves and a few small fishes ? Mark viii. 6.

Q. *Perhaps each one only took a little ?*

A. No ; for the Scripture says, *they did ALL eat, and had*

their FILL, and there were twelve baskets of fragments remaining.

Q. Perhaps, then, Christ created new loaves and fishes ?

A. No; for again the Scripture declares, that "*the TWO FISHES he divided among THEM ALL,*" and that "*they filled twelve baskets of the fragments of the FIVE BARLEY LOAVES.*"

Q. How can the body of Christ be contained under the compass of a small host ?

A. Our Saviour says, that our bodies shall become like the angels, that it is possible for God to make a camel pass through the eye of a needle; and how did the body of Christ pass through the *door*, and through the *stone* ?

Q. Are not the senses deceived in this matter ?

A. Not at all; the senses can only be employed on external qualities; they are not exercised on substance. In the sacrament, the external appearances are those of bread and wine; the senses perceive these, and therefore they perceive all that is within their province. As well might you say, the senses were deceived in Christ, who was God-man, and yet appeared to be only man, or in the Holy Ghost, when he appeared under the form of a dove.

Q. How can the same thing appear under two different forms, as under the form of bread and wine ?

A. The Holy Ghost appeared under the form of a *dove*, Luke iii. 22; and under the form of *parted tongues*, Acts ii. 3.

Q. Has the doctrine of transubstantiation been believed in every age of the Church ?

A. No portion of Christian doctrine is better attested. St Ambrose, lib. iv. de Sacra. c. 4, says: "Before the consecration, bread only is present; but after the sacred words are pronounced, the bread is changed into the body of our Lord." And St Gregory of Nyssa, in his Large Catechism, c. 37, declares: "I firmly believe that the bread is changed into the body of Jesus Christ."

SECTION VIII.

Q. Is Christ permanently present in the sacrament,—that is, at other than the time it is received ?

A. He is really and permanently present, from and after the time the words of consecration are pronounced.

Q. How do you prove this ?

A. At the moment Christ finished the pronouncement of these words, "This is my body," either his body was there, or his words were not true; the latter is blasphemy; therefore, his body was present, but the disciples had not yet re-

ceived it: there it was, present at other than the moment in which it was received.

Q. *Throw a little more light on this.*

A. Christ did not say, "*This shall be my body when you receive it,*" but absolutely, "*This is my body.*" The present, not the future time, is marked by the word *is*.

Q. *If the Lutheran doctrine in this matter were true, what would be the consequence?*

A. That the body of Christ would be present, not by virtue of the words of consecration, but by virtue of the manducation, which is a gross absurdity.

Q. *What says St Ambrose?* l. iv. de Sacr. c. 4.

A. "The words of consecration are as efficacious as those employed by God in the creation of the world." Hence, the body of Christ is present immediately after the words of consecration, as the world existed immediately after the pronunciation of the words which drew it out of nothing.

Q. *Repeat St Cyril in his Epistle to Cælosyrius.*

A. "None but a fool," he says, "can imagine that the consecrated host loses its virtue immediately after consecration."

Q. *Have you any other proof of the permanent presence of Christ in the Eucharist?*

A. Yes; the primitive Church preserved the Eucharist for the sick in holy vessels. In times of persecution, it was kept for a considerable time; and the bishops were wont to send it, one to another, as a mark of their strict union.

Q. *How long does Jesus Christ remain under the species?*

A. As long as the species exist.

Q. *If the blessed sacrament should fall into fire or water, would Jesus Christ suffer, or be insulted?*

A. He would be insulted if this happened by the fault of man; but if by accident, no insult would be offered to him. He is immortal and impassible; He can suffer no more; and in the cases mentioned, or any other such, the species only are consumed or changed.

Q. *Should we adore Jesus Christ in the blessed sacrament of the Eucharist?*

A. Certainly; because He, whom all the angels adore, is truly present on our altars.

Q. *Are Catholics justified in kneeling before the blessed sacrament when it is carried past them in the street, either to the sick or in religious processions?*

A. Yes; more than justified; for if, according to Scripture, we bend the knee at the name of Jesus, how much more are we bound to do so before his sacred person.

Q. Do Catholics act properly in carrying the adorable sacrament with religious pomp and solemnity in processions?

A. If the Israelites carried the ark of the alliance with great solemnity, Catholics have much more reason to carry in triumph the holy sacrament, of which the ark was only a mere figure.

Q. May it not be said, that Jesus Christ is in the sacrament, not seeking our adorations, but to be the spiritual food of our souls?

A. Jesus Christ was in the crib of Bethlehem, not to be adored merely, yet the Magi neglected not to adore him. He cured the man born blind, not merely to receive that man's adoration, yet that man neglected not to give it him. Wherever Jesus Christ is, there he is to be received and adored with sovereign honours. St Augustine, in P's. xeviii., says: "It is sinful to neglect to adore Jesus Christ in the Eucharist." St Ambrose, l. iii. de S. Spirit. c. 12, says: "We adore Jesus Christ during the celebration of the sacred mysteries."

Q. Are the Lutherans agreed upon this point?

A. No; Kemnitius and his partisans, order the adoration of Christ in the Eucharist; Illyricus and his party, forbid it.

CHAPTER XXV.

COMMUNION UNDER ONE KIND.

SECTION I.

Q. Is it necessary to receive the sacrament of the Eucharist under both kinds?

A. No; it is not, for three reasons: first, because what is received under both kinds, is received under one kind; secondly, because Christ has promised the same reward to the reception of one as to the reception of both; thirdly, because the ancient Church administered this sacrament often under one kind only.

Q. Why do you say that the same is received under one, as under both species?

A. Because Christ is received as he is, living and immortal, whole and entire; and, as a living body is not without blood, or living blood without a body, so Christ is received as he is, under either the form of bread or the form of wine.

Q. Does the priest, who receives under both, receive more than the laic?

A. No; he receives the same; for, as a man receiving two

hosts would not receive more than he who receives only one, so the reception of one species is equal to the reception of both : Christ whole and entire, being received in either case.

Q. *Why do priests alone partake of the chalice?*

A. They alone partake of it in Mass, because it is part of the sacrifice ; but priests, bishops, and even the Pope, receive under one kind only, when they receive out of Mass.

Q. *Why do you say the chalice forms part of the sacrifice?*

A. Because Christ is a priest, according to the order of Melchisedech ; now, Melchisedech offered bread and wine both ; hence, Christ has been pleased to institute the sacrifice of his body and blood, under the forms of bread and of wine.

Q. *Why do you say that Christ promises the same reward to the reception of one, as to the reception of both kinds?*

A. Because this is clearly laid down in John vi. 50 : " This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that if any man eat of it, he may not die." 52 : " If any man EAT of this BREAD, he shall live for ever." 58 : " As I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, the same shall live by me." 59 : " Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead ; he that eateth this bread shall live for ever."

Q. *What do you observe on these passages?*

A. That Christ promised eternal life to those who receive under one kind, as well as to those who receive under both. Indeed, Christ himself administered the sacrament under one kind only to the disciples at Emmaus : " And it came to pass, whilst he was at table with them, he took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to them." St Paul, 1 Cor. xi. 27, says : " Therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, OR drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord." This shows clearly, that the unworthy reception of either kind is enough to damn ; and, consequently, also, the worthy reception, enough to save ; because both the body and blood of the Lord are profaned or advantageously received, under either kind, as is evident from the conjunctive particle, AND, in the latter part of the verse, whilst the disjunctive OR is used in the former. From the account of the Last Supper given by St Luke xxii. 20, it would appear that the cup was not a necessary, even of the Apostolic communion, for it is given, not during the Supper, but after the Supper.

Q. *Why have you said that the ancient and pure Church administered the sacrament often under one kind only?*

A. Because history proves it to be the fact. Nicephorus, Hist. Eccl. l. iii. c. 7, St Cyprian, and St Basil, all allude to

the practice. The latter says, that the solitaries who lived far from towns, were in the habit of carrying with them, for the whole year, the Holy Eucharist, under the form of bread.

Q. Did not Pope Gelasius command all Catholics to receive the chalice?

A. Yes; but this was only for a time, and for the purpose of detecting the Manichean heretics, who considered wine as the creature of the devil. These heretics mingled with the Catholics, and, concealing their heretical principles, approached to communion with them. Hence, the Pope ordered the chalice also to be administered, knowing that this, being under the form of wine, would deter these heretics from profaning the sacrament.

Q. What do you conclude from this?

A. That the sacrament must have been previously administered under the form of bread, otherwise this order of Pope Gelasius would have been unnecessary.

Q. How was the sacrament given to the sick, to the young, and to infants?

A. Under the form of bread only, in the two former cases, and under the form of wine in the latter; and the Greek Church, during Lent, was in the habit of consecrating on Sunday, what should be necessary for the whole week, and under the form of bread only.

SECTION II.

Q. Has not Christ expressly said, Matt. xxvi. 27: "Drink ye all of this?"

A. Yes; but these words were addressed to the *Apostles alone*, and not to all the faithful.

Q. But if the command to drink, was here given, only to the Apostles, we may justly conclude, that the command to eat also, was given only to the Apostles?

A. The commands to eat and drink were, on this occasion, both given *only* to the Apostles and their successors,—that is to say, to the bishops and priests of the Church.

Q. How do you prove this?

A. The command to eat and to drink, was given on this occasion only to those to whom it was said: "DO THIS IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME; but these latter words were addressed only to the Apostles and their lawful successors in the ministry; because, by these last words, Christ conferred on his ministers, the power to consecrate and administer the Eucharist; and it is quite apparent, that this power was given to the Apostles only, and not to mankind in general, who have never even claimed it.

Q. Is there then no command in this passage, that the laity should receive the Eucharist?

A. Yes; the priests are ordered to distribute it by these words: "Do this in remembrance of me;" and, consequently, the laity are commanded to receive it.

Q. At what precise moment did Christ utter these words: "Do this in remembrance of me?"

A. Exactly after he had given the Eucharist, under the appearance of bread, to the Apostles; not after he had delivered the chalice to them. (Luke xxii. 19.)

Q. What may be learned from this circumstance?

A. That Christ commanded his Apostles and their successors, to administer the sacrament under the form of bread to the laity, but that he gave no such command as regards the chalice.

Q. But does not Christ say, John vii.: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye cannot have life in you?"

A. True; but we receive Christ not dead, but alive and immortal, as he is now in heaven; hence, we most certainly receive under either kind both his body and blood, for where his body is, there is his blood, soul, and divinity also. Besides, Protestants have nothing to do with this text on the present question, since they hold, that not only this text, but the whole chapter in which it is found, regard, not the sacrament of the Eucharist, but mere faith in Jesus Christ.

Q. What would you say, in addition to the above, to one who would tell you, that every thing done by Christ at the Last Supper, should continue to be practised, and hence, that all should receive under both kinds, because he administered it to all then present?

A. I would tell him: Protestants, in that case, have much to do that they neglect.

Q. What should they do, if all that Christ did be essentially necessary?

A. They should wash the feet of all that are admitted to the sacrament; they should break the bread; they should make the chalice, or cup, pass from hand to hand; they should receive the sacrament after supper, and only twelve should sit at the same table.

Q. What if Protestants reply, that these are not essential to the reception of the sacrament?

A. That is just what we say with regard to the reception of both kinds.

Q. Are not both kinds essential to the sacrament?

A. If they were, Christ would not have promised to the reception of one kind, all that he promised to him who receives both. And again, if they were, the *pure* Church of the first four centuries, would not have administered one species without the other, as she frequently did.

Q. *Why does the Catholic Church administer the sacrament under one kind only?*

A. Amongst other reasons, first, because, for the above reasons, it is evidently unnecessary to use both; and, secondly, because many accidents, exposing this most holy sacrament to irreverence (such as spilling the cup), would take place, if the cup were given to all.

Q. *Have Protestants made any admissions on this head?*

A. Yes; the Confession of Augsburg excuses the Church from any blame in this matter (p. 235); and Luther, t. ii. p. 100, says: "If you go where only one kind is administered, be content with one kind, and don't oppose the great mass of Christians;" and again, t. iii. p. 274: "If a General Council should order us to receive under both kinds, out of *contempt* for the Council, we should receive *only one*."

Q. *What do you conclude from all we have said?*

A. That Protestants, in forming their creed, have read the Scripture without studying its meaning,

Q. *What other inference would you draw?*

A. That the Scripture does not contain every necessary truth clearly laid down; otherwise, there would be no dispute on this subject.

CHAPTER XXVI.

ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

SECTION I.

Q. *Who is the author of the Mass? Was it instituted by Jesus Christ, or by the Church?*

A. Jesus Christ is the author of the essential part, or the sacrifice of his body and blood; the Church has appointed merely the accompanying ceremonial.

Q. *Did Jesus Christ offer his body and his blood for us to his Father in the Last Supper?"*

A. He did, not only upon the cross, but in his Last Supper.

Q. *How do you prove this?*

A. By the words of Christ himself. In St Luke xxii., he says : "This is my body, which IS GIVEN for you." Mark well his words. He does not say, This is my body, which *shall* be given for you, but which IS now, whilst I speak, given for you. This becomes more evident still, from the words used by Christ, whilst he held the chalice in his hands, and this whether we follow the Catholic or Protestant translation ; "This is my blood of the new testament, which IS SHED for many for the remission of sins." (Matth. xxvi. 28., P. Transl.) "For this is my blood of the new testament, which *shall* be shed for many unto remission of sins." (Matth. xxvi. 28., C. Transl.) St Mark and St Luke are equally clear, especially the latter, xxii. 20. From these passages, it is quite clear, that the chalice contained what was shed for us ; but what was shed for us, was the blood of Christ ; therefore the chalice contained the blood of Christ. But at the time of the Last Supper, Christ had not yet shed his blood for us in the sacrifice of the cross ; therefore he shed it in the sacrifice of his Last Supper ; therefore, in his Last Supper, Christ offered in sacrifice his body which was broken, his blood which was shed, for the remission of our sins ; therefore, he offered a true and real propitiatory sacrifice in his Last Supper.

Q. *What follows from this ?*

A. If Christ, in his Last Supper, offered a true and real sacrifice of his body and blood, before he offered himself in sacrifice on the cross, it follows, that all the priests of his Church must offer the same sacrifice, because Christ ordered all his ministers to do what he himself had done on that occasion : "*Do this for a commemoration of me.*"

Q. *What is the title given by David, Ps. cix., to Jesus Christ ?*

A. He styles him a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedech.

Q. *Why is he styled for ever a priest, according to the order of Melchisedech ?*

A. Because, like Melchisedech, he used bread and wine in the sacrifice.

Q. *Why is Christ styled a priest for ever, after Melchisedech's order ?*

A. Because he continues, and will continue, to offer the same sacrifice by the hands of his priests, to the end of the world.

Q. *Would Christ be a PRIEST FOR EVER, according to the order of Melchisedech, if a sacrifice, according to Melchisedech's order, had been only offered at the Last Supper by himself ?*

A. No ; for in that case, he would not be a priest *for ever*, but only for once, according to the order of Melchisedech ; to be a *priest for ever*, it was necessary he should establish an everlasting order of priests, to offer the same sacrifice, as his substitutes.

Q. *Would Christ be a priest, according to the order of Melchisedech, if he had not used bread and wine in a true and real sacrifice in the Last Supper ?*

A. No ; for if he did not do so in the Last Supper, he is not a priest at all, according to the order of Melchisedech ; since there is no resemblance between his sacrifice on the cross and the sacrifice of Melchisedech ; and if Christ did not, at his Last Supper, he never at any other time did, offer a sacrifice similar in any manner to that of Melchisedech.

Q. *What does the prophet Malachias say touching this sacrifice ?*

A. "From the *rising* of the sun, even to the *going down* thereof, my name is great among the Gentiles ; and in EVERY PLACE there is SACRIFICE, and there is *offered* to my name a *clean oblation*."

Q. *Does not Malachias foretel here merely the sacrifice of the cross ?*

A. No, not that alone ; for he speaks of a sacrifice to be offered in *every place*, and the sacrifice of the cross was offered in only *one place*, and *for one time*. Hence, there must be a sacrifice of the *New Law* intimately connected or identical with that of the cross, to be offered up in *every place*, which can be no other than the eucharistic sacrifice.

Q. *May not this clean oblation be prayer, and praise, and thanksgiving ?*

A. No ; for this would be nothing new for a prophet to foretel ; this sort of oblation was offered to God in every age, even at the time the prophecy was made. Besides, who would dare to say that his *imperfect* prayer was a *clean oblation* ? The prophet evidently alludes to some extraordinary *sacrifice*, some new *clean oblation* to come, not *already* existing, which would be substituted for all the sacrifices of the Old Law, which in the previous verses he condemns.*

Q. *What says the prophet Jeremias on this subject, xxxiii. 18 ?*

A. "Neither shall there be cut off from the priests and Levites a man before my face, to offer holocausts, and to burn sacrifices, and to kill victims *continually*."

Q. *What says St Paul ?* (Heb. v. 1.)

A. "For every high priest, taken from among men, is ordained for man, in things pertaining to God, that he may

offer *both gifts and sacrifices for sins*;" and elsewhere he says, "We have an altar of which those who serve the tabernacle dare not eat."

Q. *Do you find that these doctrines of the Apostles, or what was foretold of the Christian Church by the prophets, are realized or verified in the Protestant Church?*

A. No; for the Protestant Church has no altar, or priest, or sacrifice; all of which, according to Scripture, are clearly necessary, in the true Christian Church.

SECTION II.

Q. *How many kinds of sacrifices were there in the Old Law?*

A. There were four: the holocaust, the eucharistic, the impetratory, and the propitiatory sacrifices.

Q. *Why were victims offered in holocaust?*

A. To acknowledge the supreme dominion of God over all creatures.

Q. *For what purpose was the eucharistic sacrifice?*

A. To thank God for favours and graces received.

Q. *For what was the impetratory sacrifice instituted?*

A. To obtain from God important benefits or graces.

Q. *For what end was the propitiatory sacrifice?*

A. To render God propitious, and to expiate sin.

Q. *What says St Augustine?* (De Civ. Dei.)

A. That the one sacrifice of the Mass was instituted, to hold the place of all the sacrifices of the Old Law.

Q. *What says St Ireneus?* (L. iv. c. 33.)

A. "The Apostles received this sacrifice from Christ, the Church from the Apostles, and she offers it every where, according to the prophecy of Malachias, '*and in every place a pure sacrifice shall be offered.*'"

Q. *Has the sacrifice of the Mass been offered every where during the last two hundred years?*

A. Yes; in every Christian country of the earth.

Q. *Has it been every where offered during the last twelve hundred years.*

A. Yes; as all the ancient liturgies—Latin, Greek, Arabic, &c.—attest.

Q. *Can any one point out the priest, bishop, or Pope, who first said Mass, or the time or country in which this first Mass was said?*

A. No; no man has ever been able to make such a discovery.

Q. *What follows from this?*

A. It follows, by St Augustine's rule, that we have received the Mass from Christ and his Apostles, since, if it

were the invention of man, it could be traced to its author; for, says that Father, whatever is *universally* believed and practised in the Church, and cannot be traced to any bishop, or Pope, or Council, as its author, must have been taught and practised by the Apostles.

Q. *Give me another authority, from the many Fathers who assure us, that the pure Christian Church of the earliest ages, admitted the Mass as a true sacrifice?*

A. St Cyprian (Epist. 78) says: "Jesus Christ offered the same *sacrifice* as did Melchisedech, that is, bread and wine, his *own body and blood*.....If Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, be himself the high priest of his Father, and if he first offered himself as a sacrifice to Him, and commanded the same to be done in remembrance of him, then that priest truly stands in the place of Christ, *who does what Christ did*, and offers in the church a new and complete sacrifice to God the Father, doing what he ordained."

Q. *Is the sacrifice of the Mass a true, propitiatory sacrifice?*

A. Yes; both for the living and the dead.

Q. *In what sense is it a propitiatory sacrifice for the living?*

A. In this, that through it they obtain the spirit of compunction and grace to repent of their sins.

Q. *How is it propitiatory for the dead?*

A. It contributes to the remission of the temporal punishment,* which ~~they~~ ^{they} may still owe to the Divine Justice.

Q. *How do you prove that the Mass is truly a propitiatory sacrifice?*

A. From Matt. xxvi.: "This is my blood of the new testament, which is *shed* for many for the remission of sins;" and from Heb. v.: "For every high priest, taken from among men, is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins."

Q. *What do you conclude from these?*

A. That as we certainly have, in the Christian Church, a high priest, so his duty certainly is to offer sacrifices for sins.

Q. *Is there, then, more than one sacrifice propitiatory or expiatory? Has not the sacrifice of the cross alone expiated all sin?*

A. The sacrifice of the cross and the sacrifice of the altar are one and the same.

Q. *Why then renew every day the same sacrifice? Is not the sacrifice of the cross, once offered, sufficient?*

A. The merits and virtue of the sacrifice of the cross are

* See Treatise on Indulgences.

infinite; but that virtue and these merits must be applied, and this can only be done by certain means.

Q. What are these means by which the merits of the sacrifice of the cross are applied to our souls?

A. They are the sacraments, the sacrifice of the Mass, prayer, and good works.

Q. Amongst these means, in what light are we to regard the sacrifice of the Mass?

A. We are to regard it as a means employed by the Almighty, for applying the sacred merits of the sacrifice of the cross to our souls, in a very particular manner.

Q. Has the sacrifice of the Mass been offered for the dead since the earliest ages?

A. Yes; as is evident from the testimony of the early Fathers and writers. Tertullian, de Monog., says: "That a woman who would not have the holy sacrifice of the Mass celebrated every year for her husband, on the anniversary of his death, should be considered as one who had been divorced from him." St Cyprian, Ep. 9, says: "Our predecessors prudently advised, that no brother departing this life should nominate any churchman his executor, and, should he do it, that no oblation should be made for him, nor sacrifice offered for his repose." The Council of Chalons (anno 579) decrees, that in all solemn Masses, prayers be offered up for the souls of the departed. In fine, St Augustine, (l. xxii. de Civ. Dei,) tells us, "that one of his priests celebrated Mass in a house infested by evil spirits, and that by this their banishment was effected."

CHAPTER XXVII.

ON THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE AND CONFESSION.

SECTION I.

Q. For what end was the sacrament of penance instituted?

A. For the remission of sins committed after baptism.

Q. Is it a true sacrament?

A. Yes; because it has all the essentials of a sacrament: the outward sign in the sentence of absolution pronounced by the priest; the inward grace in the sanctifying grace of God, by which our sins are forgiven; and it is evidently instituted by Jesus Christ.

Q. Where?

A. In Matth. ix., Jesus heals the man sick of the palsy, and says to him: "Be of good heart, thy sins are forgiven thee." The Jews say: "He blasphemeth." Jesus replies, that he works this miracle, that they might know "that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." "And the multitude seeing it, feared, and glorified God, who had given such power to men." Here Christ works a tremendous miracle, to prove that he, *as man*, can forgive sins, and the people glorify God who had given such power to men.

Q. What do you conclude from this?

A. That Jesus Christ, even as man, had this power from his Father.

Q. Does he communicate this power, which he certainly had, to the pastors of the Church?

A. On the very day of his resurrection, he says to them, John xx. 21: "As my Father hath sent me, I also send you;" but he himself, even as man, had, by the above text, power from his Father to forgive sins; therefore he gave this power to his Apostles.

Q. What does he immediately add, to clear away all doubt as to this power?

A. "Breathing upon them, he said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose ~~sins~~ ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose ~~sins~~ ye shall retain, they are retained." Again, Matth. xviii. 18, Christ says: "Amen, I say to you, whatsoever ye shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven."

Q. What says St Chrysostom on these passages?

A. "To the priests is given a power, which God would not give to angels or archangels. Earthly princes have the power of binding the body, but the binding of the priest reaches even to the soul.... What the priests do below, God ratifies above, and the Master confirms the sentence of the servants."

Q. Can the priest forgive or retain sin as he pleases?

A. No; he is bound to act as St Paul did, when he pardoned the incestuous Corinthian. The Apostle declares, that what he did, "*he did it in the person of Christ*," 2 Cor. ii. The priest acts in the person of Christ, and does only what Christ would do for the sincere penitent.

Q. Is it not blasphemy to say that man can forgive sins?

A. Certainly, it is blasphemy to say, that men, *not commissioned by God* for that purpose, can do so; but it is no

blasphemy to say, that men may have that power, and have that power *from God*, since the Apostles were men, and yet they certainly had such power.

Q. On what conditions can the lawfully-ordained and commissioned priest exercise this power?

A. The penitent, to be absolved, must *detest his sins*; he must be firmly resolved to *avoid sin and its occasions* in future; he must *be willing to submit to whatever penance the priest imposes*; and, if able, he must *confess all his sins*.

SECTION II.

Q. Is the confession of sin a modern practice?

A. No; it is as ancient as revealed religion.

Q. How do you prove this?

A. In the first place, from the clearest testimony of the Old Law: "When a man or woman shall have committed any of all the sins that men are wont to commit, and by negligence shall have transgressed the commandment of the Lord, they shall *confess their sin*, and restore the principal, and a fifth part over and above," Num. v. 6. Here we have not only confession, but penance and restitution.

Q. Quote other passages on this important matter?

A. "He that hideth his sins shall not prosper; but he that shall *confess* and shall forsake them shall obtain mercy," Prov. xxviii. 13. "Be not ashamed to *say the truth* for the sake of thy soul; for there is a shame that *bringeth sin*, and a shame that *bringeth glory and grace*." See also Eccles. vi. 24, 31.

Q. Did the practice of confession exist immediately before the coming of Christ?

A. Certainly; for it is said of the immediate forerunner of Christ, St John the Baptist, "That there went out to him all the country of Judea, and all they of Jerusalem, and were baptized by him in the river Jordan, *confessing their sins*," Mark i. 5.

Q. But did not this confession merely mean confessing sin to God?

A. Protestants must be blind, indeed, not to see the absurdity of this subterfuge; do they consider that a culprit, about to be hanged, makes a real confession, if he merely confess his sin in his own mind or heart to God? No; every execution that takes place proves that they do not. Confession is the revelation of sin to man. The confession of sin to God is, in itself, without contrition, a matter of little consequence; for God *knows* all things; we confess to him in spite of ourselves. Besides, in Num. v., you see that the confession must have been to men, as the *restitution of the*

principal, and the fifth part over and above, must have been made to men.

Q. In the New Law, is confession instituted by God, or by the Church?

A. Confession is a divine institution, but the Church has fixed the time for the performance of that duty.

Q. How do you prove that confession is a divine institution?

A. From John xv. 22, where Christ says to his Apostles: "Whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained;" and from Matth. xviii.

Q. What do you conclude from these passages?

A. That before the pastors of the Church can exercise this power, the sinner must confess his sins to them.

Q. Why so?

A. By the above text, the priest has power to forgive or to retain sin, according to the disposition of the penitent; now, without confession, the exercise of this power is impossible, because, in that case, the priest cannot know what sins to retain, or what to forgive.

Q. Throw a little more light on this?

A. The priest is a judge who must decide what sins he ought to forgive, what he ought to retain; now, no judge can pronounce a **decision**, without hearing the whole case.

Q. May it not be said, that the priest is not a judge, but is appointed merely to declare the sins forgiven?

A. No; for the **keys** are given, to open and shut the gate, not to *declare that it is open*. Hence, the power which Christ gave to his Apostles and their successors, was the power of *binding and loosing*, not the power of *declaring* the penitent bound or loosed.

Q. What do you find in 1 John i. 8?

A. "If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins."

Q. May not Protestants say, that this saying, we have no sin, and this confession of our sins, merely regard God, and not the priests?

A. They must regard the priests; for who would dare to say to God that he has no sin? And does not God know all our sins already, without having recourse to our confession?

Q. Have you any other remark to make on this passage?

A. It says, if we confess our sins, God is *faithful and just* to forgive us. God is here said to be faithful and just, because he *promised* to forgive us our sins on the condition

that we confess them. The words of the Apostle are the same as the following: "If we confess our sins, God, who is faithful and just, will keep the promise he made in these words,—Whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven."

Q. *Can you produce any other texts of Scripture on this subject?*

A. St James v. 16, says: "*Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray for one another, that you may be saved.*" Here we have *confession to man* laid down as a condition to *salvation*.

Q. *May not this mean public and general confession, not to the priest, but to any neighbour?*

A. It means *confession of sin* either public or private, for either will be sufficient, and it means to the pastors of the Church, who are declared to have *power to absolve*; for what would be the use of confessing private sins to the public who cannot forgive them, and who would be scandalised by them? Besides, who would confess to those who might divulge his sins, and destroy his character?

SECTION III.

Q. *Is there any example in Scripture to prove that the first Christians confessed their sins?*

A. Yes; in Acts xix.: "*Many who believed came, confessing and showing their deeds.*"

Q. *What did the Apostles require of them besides confession?*

A. "That many of them who had followed curious arts," should bring their books together, and burn them.

Q. *What do you infer from this passage?*

A. That St Paul and the converts of Ephesus were thoroughly Catholics in this matter, seeing that they did exactly what the pastors of the Catholic Church and their people do, at the present day, in the same circumstances.

Q. *Is it clear, from the Fathers of the ancient Church, that private confession was always practised?*

A. Yes: St Cyprian, in his Sermon (de Lapsis,) says: "My dear brethren, let every one, whilst he is yet in life, and in a state to profit by the advice and assistance of the priest, confess his sins." St Basil (Quest. B. Reg., 228) remarks: "Our sins must necessarily be confessed to those to whom has been committed the dispensation of the mysteries of God."

Q. *What are St Ambrose's words?* (L. ii. de Pœnit. c. 6.)

A. "If you obtain grace, confess your sins, for an humble confession bursts all the chains of sin."

Q. *What says St Chrysostom?* (L. iii. de Sacerd.)

A. "The Jewish priests could not cure the leprosy of the body, they merely declared it cured; but the Christian priest does not merely declare, but effects the cure of the leprosy of the soul."

Q. *What says St Augustine?* (Hom. xlix. t. 10.)

A. "Let no one say, I sin secretly; I do it before God, he knows my heart, and will pardon me. Did Christ then say without reason: 'What you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed in heaven?' Were the keys then given to the Church for no purpose?" See also St Jerome, Exp. in Ezech. c. 10.

Q. *Why did the Lutherans abolish confession?*

A. "Because," says the Confession of Augsburg, "no man can remember all his sins."

Q. *Is this a good and valid reason?*

A. Certainly not; since the Catholic Church only requires, that her children be sorry for *all* their sins, and confess all that, after earnest and careful examination of conscience, they can bring to their recollection.

Q. *Was the above, the real reason why Protestants abandoned confession?*

A. No; they abolished it: first, because it was troublesome, and they did not wish to carry their cross; secondly, because their pastors were not lawfully-ordained and commissioned priests, and hence, as they had not the power to absolve, confession to them was useless: thirdly, the thing which they called the Reformed Church, taught them, that faith alone was sufficient to save them, hence it was useless to practise confession or any other scriptural precept; fourthly, these ministers were bound by no law to keep secret the sins confessed to them, hence their people would be fools to put any thing in their power.

Q. *Does the Church of England teach any thing on this subject?*

A. Yes; the Book of Common Prayer teaches both confession and the power of absolving; and even the Kirk of Scotland (see Confess. Visit. of Sick), whose ministers have certainly no ordination, would willingly lead their people to confess: but these spurious Churches have never succeeded in this attempt.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

ON EXTREME UNCTION.

Q. Where does the Scripture mention the sacrament of Extreme Unction?

A. In James v. 14: "Is any one sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord. And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him."

Q. What do you conclude from these words?

A. That, according to Scripture, every Christian in danger of death, should be anointed by the priests of the Church.

Q. What would you say to a Protestant, touching these words of St James?

A. You boast, I would say, of following the Scripture to the letter, in every thing; how is it, then, that you never anoint one of your sick, whilst you are aware that there is an express command in the Scripture to this effect?

Q. May not Protestants say, that this passage of St James is to be understood of a miraculous unction, like that in St Mark vi. 13: "And they cast out many devils, and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them?"

A. No: this passage is rather a confirmation of our doctrine; for the Apostles, through the sacraments, often wrought miracles; as in Acts xix., St Paul works miracles through Confirmation. These miracles were not an essential part of the sacraments administered; they were an extraordinary exhibition of God's power to induce an unbelieving world to admit, not only the sacraments so miraculously established, but to admit also the truth of Christianity. When, however, the world was converted, these wonderful accompaniments of the sacraments were no longer necessary.

Q. Have you any other reply to make on this matter?

A. Yes; the words of St James are so clear that it is impossible to explain them away. By these words, *all priests* are ordered to anoint; from St Mark this does not appear. 2dly, By the words of St James, *all the sick* are to be anointed; from St Mark it is only clear that *many* were anointed. 3dly, This duty of anointing the sick is, by St James, expressly confined to the priest; whilst the gift of healing maladies and sickness, in St Mark, is given to others, as well as to the pastors of the Church. Finally, the unction mentioned by

St James, is to produce the effect of saving by the remission of sin, which proves it evidently to be an institution of Jesus Christ ; for only He, by a material mean, can produce such an effect. Now, such effects are not at all attributed to the unction mentioned by St Mark.

Q. Does not the word presbyter mean elder, in the above passage?

A. Certainly not, in the Protestant sense. The pastors of the Church were, in the primitive ages, called presbyters, because they were generally elderly men ; such beings as kirk-elders were unknown in the Church, until Protestantism made its appearance. But what sets the matter at rest, is the circumstance, that the Apostles are called presbyters in 1 Peter v. 1 ; in 2 John i. 1 ; and in 3 John i. 1.

Q. Is Extreme Unction a sacrament?

A. Clearly ; because it is a visible sign, which, by divine institution, confers invisible grace.

Q. What is the sensible sign?

A. The anointing with holy oil, accompanied by prayer : " Let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord," James v.

Q. What is the invisible grace given?

A. The sanctifying grace of God, by which sin is washed away and forgiven ; the actual grace of God, by which the soul is strengthened, and sometimes the restoration of the body to health, according to these words : " And the prayer of faith shall save the sick man ; and the Lord shall raise him up ; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him."

Q. How do you show that Christ instituted this sacrament?

A. Protestants believe St James to be an inspired Apostle ; and can they for a moment imagine, that such a man would even speak of a rite, by which man is to be saved, raised up, and forgiven his sins, unless as an Apostle, taught by the Redeemer himself, he had the express institution and authority of his Divine Master?

Q. Do the Fathers mention this sacrament in their writings?

A. St Augustine, Serm. 215, de Temp., say : " As often as sickness happens, the sick man should receive the eucharistical sacrament, and then the unction of his body, in order to comply with the words of the Apostle James, v. : '*Is any sick amongst you?*' &c."

Q. Did the Church of England ever use this rite?

A. Yes ; in the first Liturgy of Edward VI., the use of Chrism and Extreme Unction are ordered. (See Visit. of Sick, p. 114.)

CHAPTER XXIX.

ON HOLY ORDERS.

SECTION I.

Q. Who sends the pastors of the Church?

A. Christ himself sent the first pastors, in these words: "Going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them," &c. These first pastors, aided by the Spirit of God in making their selection, appointed their successors; and thus, through the chief bishop of the Church, the body of pastors have continued down to the present day.

Q. May not any man set himself up for a Christian teacher, if he be chosen by the people, as the Presbyterian ministers are?

A. Certainly not; since St Paul says, Heb. v. 4: "Neither doth any man take the honour to himself, but he that is called" (not by the mob, but) "*by God, as Aaron was.*" "How can they preach," says St Paul again, Rom. x. 15, "unless they be sent?"

Q. Have you any other texts on this subject?

A. In St John x., Christ says: "For he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief and a robber." Again, Matth. xv. 14, those who intrude themselves into the pastoral office, are represented as "blind leaders of the blind," who, with their unfortunate followers, will "fall into the pit."

Q. What are the principal duties of the pastors of the Church?

A. To preach the Gospel, Matth. xxviii. 19; to baptize, Matth. xxviii. 19; to offer up the holy sacrifice of the Eucharist, Luke xxii. 19; to forgive sins, by the power with which God has invested them, John xx. 22; and to administer the holy sacraments of which we are now treating.

Q. Did the Apostles communicate their sacred powers to those who succeeded them?

A. This is clear from the words of Christ, who said he would be with them all days, even to the consummation of the world. Now, he could not be with the Apostles all days, as the pastors of his Church; therefore, he meant that he would be with them and their successors all days, even to the end. Besides, we hear St Paul, Acts xx. 28, address the chief pastors who were to succeed him in these words: "Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost has placed you bishops to rule the Church of God" In fine, the religion of Christ was to be the religion of all

time ; therefore, of necessity, it must have, at all times, pastors ordained and sent as the Apostles were.

Q. Are bishops superior to priests in authority and jurisdiction?

A. Certainly, as much superior to the priests as the Apostles were to the other disciples. When Judas fell from the Apostleship, the other Apostles elected and raised Matthias to his place, according to that prophecy : " His bishopric let another take," Acts i. 16-24. St Paul, Acts xx. 28, says, the bishops are to rule the Church of God. In 1 Tim. v. 19, he says : " Against a priest receive not an accusation, but under two or three witnesses ;" from which the superiority of bishops is more than evident, as they are here constituted the JUDGES of the priesthood.

Q. Where, in the sacrament of holy orders, have we the outward sign?

A. In the imposition of the bishop's hands, the delivery of the necessary instruments, and prayer. Read the ordination of the seven deacons, Acts vi. 6 ; and that of SS. Paul and Barnabas, Acts xiii. 3.

Q. Where does it appear that inward grace is conferred in this sacrament?

A. In 1 Tim. iv. 14, where St Paul says to Timothy : " Neglect not the *grace* that is in thee, which was *given thee by prophecy, by the imposition of the hands of the priesthood ;*" and in 2 Tim. i. 6 : " Stir up the *grace of God* which is in thee *by the imposition of my hands.*"

Q. Who has the power to ordain priests?

A. None but bishops.

Q. How do you prove this?

A. From Titus i. 5, where St Paul says to Titus, bishop of Crete : " For this cause I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and shouldst *ordain priests in every city, as I also appointed thee ;*" and from 1 Tim. v. 22, where St Paul tells the bishop of Ephesus, " not to impose hands lightly on any man."

Q. Can you establish the superiority of bishops from tradition?

A. Very clearly : From the very establishment of Christianity down to the time of Luther, we defy any adversary to name even one person considered a priest, who was not ordained by some bishop.

Q. What do the Fathers say?

A. St Ignatius, a disciple of the Apostles, who succeeded St Peter in the See of Antioch, says, Ep. ad Trall. : " Reverence your bishop, as Christ himself, like as the blessed

Apostles have commanded us ; for who is the bishop, but he who has all power and principality over all." Again, Ep. ad Magnes. : "It becomes you to obey your bishop, and in nothing to resist him,...whether you be priest, deacon, or laic." St Cyprian, Ep. 55, says : "Heresies and schisms rise from no other source, but disobedience to the chief pastors." Tertullian, de Bap., c. 17, writes : "The bishop, indeed, has a right to give baptism, and next the priest and deacons, but not without the authority of the bishops."

Q. What says St Epiphanius, Con. Aërius ?

A. That the 65th Heresy, condemned by the Church, consisted in maintaining, as Aërius had done, that the powers of the bishop and the priest were equal. He adds, that there is this difference between the bishops and priests ; that the priests are the spiritual fathers of the people by baptism, whilst the bishops are the spiritual fathers of the priests by ordination.

Q. What was done at the Council of Alexandria ?

A. All the ordinations of Colluthus were declared null, because he was only a priest.

Q. What do you conclude from all this ?

A. That none but Catholics have true and real priests, or pastors ; because, in other Churches, the ministers are not ordained at all, or ordained by men whose episcopal ordination is doubtful ; hence, I conclude also, that sectarians are deprived of the greater part of the sacraments ; their ministry is not of divine appointment, but self-constituted ; and their Church forms no part of the Church of Christ. "Where there is no episcopal ordination," says the Protestant Dodwell, "there is no ministry, no sacrament, no Church."

CHAPTER XXX.

ON MATRIMONY.

Q. Has marriage all the necessary constituents of a sacrament ?

A. It has the outward sign, in the mutual consent of the parties, externally signified ; accompanied by the other conditions, which the ecclesiastical law requires. The inward grace is that which enables the married couple to discharge their duties faithfully, and in a Christian manner, to one another, and to train up their children in the fear of God ;

and the divine institution is evident from Matth. xix. 6, where it is said, "Wherefore they are no more two, but one flesh; what therefore *God hath joined together*, let no man put asunder."

Q. *How does it appear that grace is conferred in the sacrament of marriage?*

A. In the first place, you see from Matth. xix., quoted above, that God is the author of marriage, and surely you will admit, that he will give to those, whom he joins in this holy union, such graces as will enable them to discharge the duties of it. 2dly, St Paul expressly says, Ephes. v. 32: "This is a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church,"—that is, that marriage is, in the New Law of Christ and in his Church, a great sacrament; for the passage would not make sense, if this be not its meaning; if marriage be not the great sacrament here alluded to, what is this great sacrament in Christ and the Church? Christ himself and his Church cannot be a great sacrament in *Christ and the Church*; but if marriage be this great sacrament, then as a sacrament, it confers grace.

Q. *What does St Paul say, in the preceding verses, 24 and 25 of same chapter?*

A. "Therefore as the Church is subject to Christ, so also let the wives be to their husbands in all things. Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church, and gave himself up for it, that he might sanctify it." Here the union of man and wife is likened to the union of Christ and the Church; but the union of Christ and the Church is not only a union of love, but also of grace; therefore, such also is the union of man and wife.

Q. *Do not Protestants translate the above word sacrament, by mystery, in Ephes. v. 32?*

A. Yes; but they had an object in doing so: they wished to deny the sacrament of marriage; and, to show them that they have made nonsense of the text, you have only to ask them, what *mystery* there is in marriage, if it be not a sacrament? and, if not a sacrament, how is it *greater* in Christ and the Church, than it was at any former period of the world? St Augustine reads *sacrament*; and St Jerome, who *restored the New Testament to the truth of the Greek, and the Old, to the truth of the Hebrew*, who lived fourteen hundred years ago, and who was one of the greatest linguists of that or any other age,—this St Jerome reads *sacrament* for *mystery*.

Q. *What does St Augustine say as to the sacrament of Matrimony, De Bono Conjug. c. 18, t. vi. p. 33; Ibid, c. xxiv. p. 337?*

A. He says: "In the marriage of our women, the *sanctity of the sacrament* is of the greatest weight;" and again: "In all nations, the great good of marriage consists in the propagation of children and the fidelity of the parties; but among Christians there is, besides, the HOLINESS OF THE SACRAMENT." Tertullian, also, in his Treatise de Monog., expressly calls matrimony a *sacrament*. St Ireneus, Adv. Hær., l. i. c. 1. says: "By all means they ought to meditate on the sacrament of marriage." St Cyril adds, c. ii. in Joan. 22: "Christ sanctified wedlock, and gave *grace* to marriage." St Ambrose, l. i. de Abram., and in c. v. ad Ephes., writes: "There is a great sacrament in the union of man and wife."

Q. Are all Christians bound to marry by the command of God?

A. Certainly not; for if they were, St Paul has given a very bad advice.

Q. Repeat his words, 1. Cor. vii. 8.

A. "But I say to the unmarried, and to the widows, it is good for them *if they so continue, even as I.*"

Q. Does not the Apostle say, in ver. 2, "But for fear of fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband?"

A. Yes; but in ver. 1, he says, "it is good for a man not to touch a woman;" and in ver. 9, "but if they do not contain themselves, let them marry." Hence, the Apostle's meaning evidently is, that those who do not feel, that, with the help of God's grace, they can live chaste lives, ought to marry, and that, once married, each man should confine himself to his *own* wife, and each wife to her *own* husband. Indeed, ver. 27, he says, "Art thou loosed from a wife? *seek not a wife;*" and, in several passages, he exhorts all who are able, to live, like himself, a single life. (See chap. vii. ver. 7.)

Q. Does not God order Adam and Eve, and the whole human race, to increase and multiply?

A. This is not a command to all, but a blessing by which God accords fecundity to all that shall marry. Those Protestants who understand it as a command, must charge St Paul, one of God's inspired Apostles, with breaking the law of God. How can Protestants argue thus, seeing that a great number of themselves never marry? and what is to be done with those who cannot get married?

Q. Does the Catholic Church forbid any one to marry?

A. No; she leaves every one at liberty to do as he thinks proper.

Q. Does she not forbid the marriage of priests?

A. She forbids priests to marry, but she obliges no one to become a priest.

Q. *To what does she oblige those who enter into holy orders?*

A. To keep the vow of chastity, which they have voluntarily, and after mature deliberation, made to God.

Q. *Why does she oblige them to this?*

A. That they may be more at liberty to discharge their duties to their flock, and that they may be totally disengaged from temporal matters. These advantages of the unmarried priest over the married Protestant minister were acknowledged, even by Protestants, during the prevalence of that horrid plague, the cholera, and are still openly visible to all, when typhus fever and other contagious diseases scourge our population.

Q. *Does St Paul clearly urge these advantages, in 1 Cor. vii. 32, 33?*

A. Yes; he says: "But I would have you without solicitude. He that is *without a wife* is *solicitous* for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God. But he that is *with a wife* is *solicitous* for the things of the world, how he may please his wife; and he is divided."

Q. *In any of the early ages of the Church, were bishops or priests permitted to marry, after entering into holy orders?*

A. No; we defy our adversaries to name even one such case.

Q. *What are the words of the 2d Council of Carthage, Can. 2?*

A. "That bishops, priests, and all who are charged with the administration of the sacraments, must lead *continent lives*."

Q. *What reason does the Council give for this ordinance?*

A. "This," adds the Council, "was taught by the Apostles, and has been *always practised* by the Church."

Q. *What do you infer from all that has been said on this subject?*

A. That reason, antiquity, and Scripture, are all on the side of Catholic doctrine and practice.

CHAPTER XXXI.

ON PERSECUTION.

Q. *Is persecution, on account of religious belief, a Catholic tenet?*

A. No. Although some Catholics are said to have persecuted, if matters are carefully examined, it will be found, that, in some instances, the persecutions arose out of the wicked

spirit of revenge, and in others, that it was not religious opinion which was persecuted, but gross moral and political crimes. If Catholics have ever been guilty of persecution, the crime was their own, not that of their religion.

Q. Did Protestants persecute Catholics?

A. Yes; in every country where the reformed doctrines were received, Catholics were persecuted. C. Paterson Hooft reproaches his Protestant countrymen of Holland thus: "Actuated by a hatred of cruelty, you rush yourselves into acts of cruelty; no sooner have you secured your freedom, than you wish to tyrannise over others."—Hist. Ref. Ger. Brand, t. i. p. 333. Knox commenced the Reformation in Scotland, by being a party to the murder of Cardinal Beaton. In 1560, the Parliament established Presbyterianism, and ordered all the professors of the ancient faith to be punished with death. "With such indecent haste," says Robertson, "did the very persons, who had just escaped ecclesiastical tyranny, proceed to imitate the example." In 1596, the Presbytery, writing to the King and Council concerning the Earls of Huntly, Errol, &c. say that, "as they had been guilty of idolatry, a crime deserving of death, the civil power could not spare them."

Q. Did the French Protestants persecute?

A. They rebelled against their sovereign, prohibited the Catholic religion, murdered the priests and religious, burnt the churches and convents, and dug up the dead, to make bullets of their leaden coffins. (Maimbourg, Thuanus, Hist. Calv. l. 31.) Nic. Fromenteau, a Protestant, confesses, that in Dauphiné alone, they killed two hundred and fifty-six priests, and one hundred and twelve monks or friars. In these atrocities, the Protestant Baron des Adrets forced Catholic prisoners to jump from the towers upon the pikes of his soldiers, and obliged *his own children to wash their hands in the blood of Catholics.* (Liv. de Financé.)

Q. Did Protestant England persecute Catholic Ireland?

A. Dr Curry has preserved, amongst many other martyrs, the names of twenty-seven priests, who suffered death on account of their religion. (Civil Wars, vol. i. p. 8.) See Spondanus and Pagi on the martyrdom of F. O'Hurle, the Catholic Archbishop of Cashel, a sanguinary deed, perpetrated by Sir W. Drury. See also Bourke's *Hib. Dominicana*, where the number of Irish martyrs, and their dreadful deaths, are detailed.

Q. Did not the Duke of Alva boast, that in the Low Countries, he had delivered eighteen thousand heretics to the executioners?

A. These *heretics* should have been called *rebels*, since, according to the Protestant writer Brand, they had conspired against the life of the Duke, then Spanish governor, and put to death, in cold blood, all the priests and religious they could lay their hands upon. See Brand, *Réform des Pays Bas*. Feller, *Hist. Dict. art. Toledo*, says, that Vandermerk slaughtered more unoffending Catholic priests and peasants in 1572, than Alva executed Protestants during his whole government. See Mons. Kerroux, *L'Abregé de l'Hist. de la Hollande*.

Q. Did not the 4th Lateran Council, in 1215, expressly ordain the persecution of heretics?

A. In the first place, Matthew of Paris (ad dict. ann.) denies that the supposed persecuting Canon was the act of that Council; 2dly, even Dupin, who was more Protestant than Catholic, tom. x. p. 104, says, "it is certain that this chapter (the persecuting Canon) is not the work of the Council;" 3dly, the learned Protestant divine Collier, *Eccl. Hist.* vol. i. p. 424, declares that the Canon in question "is spurious;" 4thly, supposing this Canon to be genuine, it was framed for a particular case, and not by the ecclesiastical part of the Council alone, but by all the sovereigns of Europe, who were present at the Council, either by themselves or by their ambassadors.

Q. For what particular class of heretics was this Canon adopted?

A. It was framed to check the horrible brutalities of the Albigenses, who taught that there were two Gods, one good and the other evil; that no one could be saved in a married state; that unnatural gratifications should be substituted for those of marriage; that no kind of flesh-meat could be used without sin: they threw the Scriptures into the common sewers, and profaned horribly even the sacred vessels of the altar. All these, and many other dreadful impieties, they openly taught and practised, so that even Mosheim, *Eccl. Hist.* vol. iii., says: "Their shocking violation of decency was a consequence of their pernicious system; they looked upon modesty and decency as marks of inward corruption." What wonder, then, if both fire and sword were employed by both Church and State to extirpate from the earth an execrable race, who conspired thus both against God and man? Angels shuddered at their unnatural brutalities, whilst kings trembled lest the human race should be destroyed. Such were the men so often pitied by Protestants as a persecuted race. See Limburch. *Hist. of Inquis.*

Q. Did not the Council of Constance persecute Wyckliff?

A. He was treated very mercifully: notwithstanding his *sedition* and impious doctrines, he was left unpunished during his whole life. Dr Feddes, *Life of Wolsey*, p. 38, Protestant as he was, says: "It was not for their *speculative* opinions that the followers of Wyckliff were punished, but because they maintained opinions derogatory to the rights of princes, injurious to society, and contrary to law;" and Arehb. Parker says: "The laws against them were *necessary*, on account of the *tumults* they have occasioned."

Q. What were these impious and seditious doctrines of Wyckliff?

A. He taught that one mortal sin in a rector, bishop, magistrate, or sovereign, justified the people in disobeying and deposing these authorities (Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.* p. 283); that no civil laws were to be obeyed, no taxes paid, unless the justice of such laws could be proved from Scripture (*ibid*); that no man could lawfully swear in a court of justice (*ibid*, page 204), or confirm his own or his friend's title to an estate for ever (Knyght, *Col.* 2707); that it was sinful in any clergyman to have one shilling's worth of property (*ibid*, 2648); that his followers should despoil all that had property (Walsing. p. 284); that God ought to obey the devil (Knyght, *Col.* 2648); that colleges and universities were diabolical (Condem. *Coun. Constan.* art. 29); that it was unlawful to pray in churches, or keep the Lord's-day (Hypodig. Walsing. p. 557); that temporal princes should cut off the head of any ecclesiastic who sinned; and that, if the prince himself sinned, the people should punish him (Knyght, *Col.* 2657).

Q. Did this dreadful doctrine produce its bitter fruit?

A. In four years from the time he opened his mission, he and his followers produced amongst the people insurrection, plunder, murder, and civil war. The Chancellor, Primate Ludbury, Lord Treasurer Hales, and Chief Justice Cavendish, were murdered by the Wyckliffite rioters, and their intention was to kill the King himself and all the nobility (Walsing. *Hist.* p. 265.) They fixed advertisements to the church doors in London, declaring that they had raised one hundred thousand men, to combat those who did not agree to their opinions. (*Ibid*, 385.)

Q. On what ground can the Council of Constance, composed both of bishops and princes, be attacked?

A. Certainly on no just ground; for there is not at the present day a Protestant government in the world, which would not, and justly too, punish, with beheading and quarter-

ing, such dreadful doctrines; and yet in Catholic times, the monster who taught these died a natural death.

Q. At least, John Huss and Jerom of Prague were put to death?

A. Yes; but they caused violent seditions in Bohemia; they excited a general insurrection; they deluged the country with blood. "The Hussites began by murdering the Mayor of Prague, then they overturned the government of the kingdom, after fighting several battles against their Sovereign in the field, and after every where burning down monasteries, murdering the clergy, and even those who protected them." —Æneas Sylv. ap Fleury.

Q. But were not Huss and Jerom put to death by the ecclesiastical Council of Constance?

A. No; the Council excommunicated them, and declared it had no farther power regarding them (Sess. 15). Nay, the Church under her highest penalty, forbids any ecclesiastic to concur in any sanguinary punishment; and hence, the bishops in Parliament leave the house, when trials of life and death are going on.

Q. But were not these men burnt at the instance of the Council?

A. No; they were committed to the flames by the magistrates, acting on the laws of the land; and by the order of the Elector Palatine and of the Emperor Sigismond (L'Enfant, l. iii. §. 48). Nor had the Council any thing to do with their death; its acts are still extant; and we have its history by L'Enfant, a Calvinist, who does not even hint at such solicitation on the part of the Council.

Q. Was not the Council culpable in permitting the execution of these men, after granting them a safe-conduct?

A. The Council could not prevent the execution of seditious rebels; John Huss had no safe-conduct, but merely a passport, promising him protection to and from the Council (L'Enfant, Hist. Const. l. i. parag. 41). The Council was guilty of no breach of faith to Jerom, but he was guilty of flagrant perjury to the Council; he publicly anathematized his own doctrine, and yet afterwards confessed, that, at the time he denounced it, he believed every tittle of it in his heart. (L'Enfant, lib. v. parag. 75.)

Q. Are not the Protestants who were slaughtered on St Bartholomew's day at Paris, an undeniable proof that the Catholic Church persecutes?

A. Very far from it; that massacre was caused by the unrelenting vengeance of Charles IX. and the bloody ambition of Catherine de Medicis. "On the day of this massacre an

edict is published, in which the King declares, that whatever had happened was done by his express order, and *not out of hatred to Protestants*, but to put an end to the conspiracy of the Calvinist Coligni, and his nefarious companions."

Q. What did the Calvinists do, which thus provoked the inexcusable vengeance of the King?

A. They were reported to the King, as having hatched a plot to overturn his government, and destroy himself. They certainly attempted to seize the King, and overturn the constitution of his dominions (Maimb., lib. iv.); they threatened to whip the King, and to make a mechanic of him (ibid); they fought four battles against him, and treasonably delivered Havre de Grace, the key of his dominions, to Queen Elisabeth, a foreign potentate; they murdered multitudes of priests, religious, and unarmed people; burned churches and monasteries; and made rivers of blood flow in the very streets of Paris (Davila.) In the city of Paniers, they murdered all the clergy who composed a procession on *Corpus Christi*. (Heylin, Hist. Presb. lib. ii.)

Q. Did the bishops not encourage the massacre of St Bartholomew?

A. No; on the contrary, the bishop of Lisieux opposed the execution of the King's order, saying: "It is the duty of the good shepherd to lay down his life for his sheep, not to let them be slaughtered before his face. These are my sheep, though they are gone astray, and I am resolved to run all hazards in protecting them." Maimb. Conten. Fleury, &c.

Q. Did not Pope Gregory XIII. rejoice when he heard of this massacre?

A. If he did, it was because the matter was represented to him, not in its true colours, but as a victory gained by the King, in a fair manner, over impiety and sedition. Thuan. lib. i.; Maimb. lib. iv. "The Pope considered Charles's act, as a necessary act of self-defence against the infamous, treasonable, and bloody plot of the Calvinists, Coligni, &c. against his life and government." Pagi. Brev. Gest. Rom. Pont. vol. vi. p. 729.

CHAPTER XXXII.

ON THE INQUISITION.

Q. Is not the Inquisition a state engine, employed by the Catholic Church for the purpose of persecution?

A. No; the Church has not, and never had, any connec-

tion with the Inquisition, farther than this, that *some of her members*, through mistaken zeal, resorted to this cruel and unwarrantable means, for the purpose of suppressing immoral, blasphemous, and infidel doctrines.

Q. Why do you say that the Inquisition is no part of the Catholic religion?

A. Because no such court existed till the Twelfth Century; and in many Catholic countries no such tribunal ever existed; whilst, in some of those where it was established, it has been long since suppressed.

Q. Was not St Dominic the founder of the Inquisition?

A. This is a Protestant calumny; it was nowhere established till after his death. Mosheim, sec. xiii.

Q. If some Popes, and Bishops, and Catholic Princes, established, and used this dreadful engine, it must certainly be a part of the Catholic religion?

A. No more than Queen Elisabeth's Court of High Commission, which the Dissenters of that period declared to be more intolerable than the Inquisition itself, was a necessary part of Protestantism. Hume, Hist. Eng. James II. c. vi.; Mosheim, vol. iv. p. 395.

Q. Was not the Inquisition, with ecclesiastics at its head, competent to pass sentence of the loss of limbs or of death?

A. No; it had no such power. Very few received sentence of death at all. Of the Roman Inquisition there is not one such sentence recorded; and more blood was shed by the Calvinistic Huguenots of France on account of religion, than would have been shed by five hundred Spanish Inquisitions.

Q. Why such an engine at all?

A. The rulers at that time were, in their wisdom, impressed with the idea, that it was the best mode of suppressing sacrilege, profanation, apostacy, magic, and other crimes, which are corporally punished in every country, whether Catholic or Protestant. How many *witches* did the Calvinist ministers burn in Scotland? (Lyon's Hist. of St Andrews.) How many Papists did they persecute and prosecute? (Arnot's Hist. of Edinburgh.)

Q. Did not the Catholic Church at Madeira persecute lately Dr Kalley and Maria Joaquina?

A. No; but the Catholic people at Madeira would not tolerate an insolent apothecary from Kilmarnock to violate the laws of their country, which, under severe penalties, forbid blasphemy. Had that personage confined himself, not to the vending of corrupt Bibles and outrageous blasphemies, but to his legitimate province, the vending of pills, the autho-

rities would not consider him worth their attention. The medical, however, did not seem to pay him so well as the religious pill, though no doubt both were equally noxious.

Q. Have Protestants been guilty of a persecution exactly similar to this?

A. Various persons, such as Carlisle, have been lately imprisoned in London for blasphemy; and the Presbyterians of Scotland have shown equal zeal, for they have now, or lately had, two persons in prison in Edinburgh for the same crime. Thus do Protestants blame Catholics for what they themselves think it a duty to do.

Q. The Inquisition, then, is no essential part of the Catholic religion?

A. It is so far from being so, that most Catholics condemn it, as loudly and as earnestly as Protestants themselves. It is a mere state engine, which certain rulers used as a matter of policy, not so much to put down heresy, as to check the seditions and immoralities that, in every age, were the consequences of heresy,—an engine which Catholics in general denounce, as opposed equally to policy, justice, and charity.

Q. Have Protestants any right to be perpetually harping on the Inquisition?

A. As a matter of principle, they should come to the charge with clean hands. What difference is there between the gaols, into which they cast thousands of Catholics, and the prison of the Inquisition? and what difference between the deaths the unhappy victims on both sides died? If Queen Mary put to death two hundred and seventy-seven Protestants for their rebellious opposition, Protestants have had ample revenge, through the first Protestant king, Henry VIII., who slaughtered sixty Catholics for denying his spiritual supremacy; and through their merciless Elisabeth, who persecuted, in most instances to death, and in all to utter ruin, twelve hundred Catholics, for their faith; and if Mary burnt her victims, Elisabeth hanged, quartered, embowelled, and burnt hers. See, for other examples of persecution, Lingard, vol. viii., reign of Elisabeth; and for the penal laws against Catholics, vol. viii. p. 143. In fact, Catholics have experienced from the Protestants of these countries only one continued persecution, more or less intense. They have been *permitted* to fight for the honour of a country, and the security of a crown, which, in return, gave them no encouragement, and, till very lately, scarcely any protection.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

ON READING THE SCRIPTURES.

Q. Do Catholics forbid the reading of the Sacred Scripture?

A. No; they only forbid the abuse of that Holy Volume, which the Catholic Church has ever preserved and regarded as one of her most sacred deposits, and without whose preservation the Protestant Church would never have had it.

Q. Is it forbidden to any one?

A. Yes, to those who would *certainly abuse it*, to those ignorantly-proud people, of whom St Peter speaks, where he says (2 Pet. iii. 16), that certain parts of St Paul's Epistles "*are hard to be understood, which the UNLEARNED and UNSTABLE wrest, as also the rest of the Scriptures, to THEIR OWN PERDITION.*"

Q. Why are not all permitted to interpret the Scripture as they will?

A. Because (2 Eph. iv. 11) God has given only "*SOME to be apostles, some prophets, other some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers.*" Because its sense is to be sought from those who were sent to teach; from the "*lips of the priest who shall keep knowledge, and from whose mouth they shall require the law.*" (Mal. ii. 7.)

Q. Do not Catholic Bishops and Popes discourage the reading of the Scriptures?

A. No; the Catholic clergy are bound to read the Scripture for nearly an hour every day; the Catholic Bishops of Great Britain publicly declared, in 1826, that the circulation of authentic copies of Scripture was never discouraged by the Church; Pius VII., in a rescript, April 18, 1820, addressed to the English Bishops, tells them "*to encourage their people to read the Holy Scriptures, because nothing can be more useful, more consoling, more animating.*" They serve to confirm the faith, to support the hope, and to inflame the charity of the true Christian."

Q. Does not the Catholic Church forbid versions of the Scripture into modern tongues, for the very purpose of keeping the Scripture from the people?

A. Even the Rev. Robert Adams refutes this Protestant slander; though a Protestant himself, he declares that the Catholic laity are not debarred the use of the Scriptures.—*Religious World Displayed*, vol. ii. p. 78. But the best refutation of this calumny is, that Pius VI., writing to Martini, Archb. of Florence, on the subject of his translation of the

Scriptures, applauds his zeal in publishing his version, and exhorts the faithful to read it. This document is dated April, 1778, and is prefixed to every English edition of the Catholic Bible.

Q. Is it not said that Catholics published few versions of Scripture till they were compelled to do so by Protestant example?

A. This is another Protestant slander, propagated to catch the ignorant. Before Protestantism had a being, there were upwards of twenty versions of the Scripture into almost all the modern languages, as will be evident from the subjoined detail.

EARLY CATHOLIC VERSIONS.	
Fist's, at Mentz,	Anno 1462
Bender's, at Augsburg,	1467
Malermi's Italian,	1471
Four Gospels, Belgic,	1472
Entire Bible, Belgic, Cologne, .	1475
Julian's,	1477
Delft Edition,	1477
Ferrier's, Spanish,	1478
Gouda Edition,	1479
Des Moulins, French,	1490
Four Versions mentioned by	
Beausobre (Hist. de la Refor.	
livre iv.) printed before	
Estaple's New Test,	1523
Old Test. printed before	1528
Brucoli's Italian,	1532
Antwerp and Louvain,	1578

EARLY PROTESTANT VERSIONS.	
Luther's New Test.,	Anno 1522
Tyndale's New Test.,	1526
First Belgic,	1527
Luther's Old Test.,	1536
Tyndale's Pentateuch,	1539
Miles Coverdale's,	1535
Olivetian's Old Test.,	1537
First Italian,	1562

CATHOLIC M.S. VERSIONS.

Whole Bible, English,	Anno 1290
Anglo Saxon,	about 1300
German, about 800 ; Italian, 1270 ;	
Spanish, 1280 ; French, 1294.*	

CHAPTER XXXIV.

ON RELIGIOUS ORDERS.

Q. What is the meaning of Religious Orders?

A. The very fact, that we have in revelation, counsels, as well as commands, proves that such Orders should exist in the Church as would observe these counsels; for Christ did not give them in vain.

Q. What do you mean by counsels?

A. Those virtues which Christ has recommended, but not

* Six versions and twelve editions of the Sacred Volume appeared in German before Luther's time. Three versions and many editions in Italian. Four versions, with a multitude of editions, were published in Gothic and French. Two Belgic Versions, with several editions. The Bohemian version was published: Prague, 1486; at Putna, 1498; at Venice, 1506 and 1511. For other Catholic translations, in almost all the languages of the world, and many of them published in Rome, the very HOT-BED OF POPERY,—see Le Long's *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Boehmer, Leipsic, 1709; and note appended to Lord Shrewsbury's Letter to Lord Bezeley, page 90.

commanded under pain of sin, such as voluntary chastity, poverty, &c.

Q. Is there not something wrong in becoming a monk or a nun?

A. No; but if we are to believe the Scripture, there is something peculiarly praiseworthy in doing so. Christ speaks often of the danger of riches; he tells the young man in the Gospel, to go and sell all that he had, and give it to the poor, if he wished to *be perfect*. Now, this is what monks and nuns do; and can there be any thing wrong in following the advice of Christ himself, in embracing a life of voluntary poverty, instead of exposing one's self to the seductive danger of riches? St Paul declares, that he who giveth his virgin in marriage doth well, but *he that giveth her not, doth better*; and can there be any thing wrong in following this advice of the Apostle, in vowing and preserving that brightest of all virtues—chastity? Christ declares that we must deny ourselves, take up our cross, and follow him; can there be any thing wrong in those who, finding that they cannot do this well in the midst of this world's temptations, retire from it into the cloister, and there practise the counsels of Christ, in obedience to, and under the guidance of, the great masters of a religious life?

Q. Are all religious employed merely in labouring for their own, or praying for the salvation of others?

A. No; many religious Orders are established entirely for the good of their neighbours: some to teach the ignorant, others to preach the Gospel; some to provide for the poor, others to imbue the minds of the rich youth with knowledge and virtue; some to attend the sick, especially in the public hospitals, and others to redeem the slave and the captive.

Q. May there not be abuses in these establishments?

A. There is nothing so good that it may not be abused. marriage, every profession, the very Word of God, nay, our common Christianity, are all occasionally abused; but surely no good Christian will think this an argument either against them, or to get rid of them.

CHAPTER XXXV.

ON THE CHARGE OF IGNORANCE.

Q. Did not the Reformation bring learning into the world?

A. Protestants attribute to the Reformation, what is due

solely to the art of printing, discovered a short time before the introduction of Protestantism.

Q. Did Catholics use the art of printing to promote learning before Luther's time?

A. Before the end of the Fifteenth Century, printing presses were wrought in *thirty-four towns of France alone*; and between the years 1455 and 1536, *twenty-two millions nine hundred and thirty-two thousand volumes had been printed*. Popes Nicholas V. and Sixtus IV., with the Princes and Kings of most European countries, were the munificent patrons of the arts and sciences. (*Recherches sur les Biblioth.*, pp. 82, 207.) Learning was in such a flourishing state in Germany, that ten Universities were founded between the years 1403 and 1506. Erasmus declares, that "learning triumphed in England, that the King, the Queen, two Cardinals, and almost all the Bishops, exerted themselves in promoting it." (*Ad Pet. Bem.*; Basil. 1518.) Indeed, all the Universities in Europe were founded by Catholics, and in Catholic times. During three hundred years, Protestants have shown their wish to promote learning by the erection of only two Universities, those of Dublin and London.

Q. By whom were the Universities of Scotland erected?

A. By Bishops and Popes. That of St Andrews, by Bishop Wardlaw, under the sanction of Benedict XIII., in 1413; that of Glasgow, by Pope Nicholas V., aided by Bishops Muirhead and Turnbull, in 1450; that of Aberdeen, by Pope Alexander VI., to which Bishop Elphinstone largely contributed. Even the Edinburgh University was projected by Bishop Reid of Orkney, who left eight thousand merks for that purpose. Indeed, every nation in Europe, by the proudest monuments, such as Oxford, Cambridge, Bologna, Sarbonne, Salamanca, bears irrefragable testimony to the untiring exertions of the Catholic Church for the promotion of the arts and sciences.

Q. Can you illustrate this matter by any additional consideration?

A. Yes; is not Europe indebted to Catholic Bishops and Popes for its civilization, its laws, and all its knowledge of the fine arts? Are not painting, sculpture, music, and architecture, all entirely Catholic? If you doubt of this, only look to the magnificent abbeys and cathedrals which have survived the fury of Vandalic reform, and which the barbarous hand of Protestantism has left only as interesting ruins, and you will be quickly convinced. No wonder, then, that the candid Colonel Mitchell, in his *Life of Wallenstein*, should

declare, that "deep and indelible is the debt which RELIGION AND CIVILIZATION OWE TO THE EARLY ROMAN PONTIFFS, AND TO THE CHURCH OF ROME. They strove long and nobly to forward the cause of human improvement."

Q. *Did not even the monasteries possess large libraries and men of learning?*

A. For this we have excellent Protestant authority. "The monasteries....had more opportunities for study than the secular clergy possessed....But their most important service was as secure repositories for books. All our manuscripts have been preserved in this manner." (Hallam, *Med. Ages*, vol. ii. p. 439.) "When the monks were settled, in the reign of King Edgar, they promoted a general improvement; they were very industrious in restoring learning, and retrieving the country from the remarkable ignorance of these times." (Collier, *Hist. Eccl.*) "*A little before the Reformation, many of the great monasteries were NURSERIES OF LEARNING; the SUPERIORS of monasteries were men of distinction.*" (Ibid.) Bishop Tanner says: "The monasteries were schools of learning and education."

Q. *What was the order of Pope Gregory VII. to the bishops of the Church?*

A. He urged all the Bishops in Christendom, to encourage literature and the arts, and to have each a school attached to his Cathedral Church. (Voigt, *Hist.*, French Trans. p. 500.)

Q. *What was the opinion of Burke, Gibbon, and Lord Hutchinson, as to Catholic learning?*

A. The first declared, that "France alone had produced more eminent scholars, than all the Protestant Universities of Europe;" the second said, that "one monastery of Benedictine Monks, gave to the world more works of learning than both the Universities of England;" and the third spoke thus to the British House of Lords: "Catholicity, which has this might been the subject of so much abuse, has been the belief of the most extensive and ENLIGHTENED nations of Europe, and of the most illustrious characters, that ever did honour to the name of man." (Cob., *Letter i.*; Lingard's *Tracts*, p. 63.)

Q. *Do not Protestant countries stand much higher in education and prosperity, than Catholic countries?*

A. They turn their whole attention to worldly prosperity; religion gives them little concern; and hence, it would not be very surprising if, in worldly matters, they were in advance. That such, however, is not the case, you have only to read *Howitt's Germany*—Tait, Feb. 1843; *Turnbull's Austria*, vol. i. p. 219; *Ibid*, vol. ii. pp. 66, 72; *Borrow's Bible in*

Spain, c. v. Even Dr Welsh, in the General Assembly of 1835, admitted, that Scotland, "instead of being the very first in point of education, holds a very low place in respect of some Protestant, and I must," he says, "add some ROMAN CATHOLIC COUNTRIES." This, for a minister, is a very large admission; and when taken in connexion with the declaration of the present Secretary of State on the Factory question, "that Protestant England is the most ignorant Christian country in the world," and with the astounding proofs of spiritual and temporal ignorance laid before that Factory Commission, must be considered as perfectly conclusive.

Q. *What does Mr Laing*—Notes of a Traveller, pp. 435, 442—*say as to the comparative state of education?*

A. In page 435, he says: "The education of the regular clergy of the Catholic Church is, perhaps positively higher, and, beyond doubt, comparatively higher, than the education of the Scotch clergy. By positively higher, is meant that among a given number of Popish and of Scotch clergy, a greater proportion of the *former* will be found, who read with ease and a perfect mastery, the ancient languages—Greek, Latin, and Hebrew—and the Eastern languages connected with that of the Old Testament,—a greater number of profound scholars, a greater number of high mathematicians, and a higher average amount of acquired knowledge." In p. 442, he adds: "The Catholic clergy adroitly seized on education, and not, as *we suppose in Protestant countries*, to keep the people in darkness and ignorance, and to inculcate error and superstition, but to be at the head of the great social influence of useful knowledge." Again, in page 439, alluding to the gross calumny, "that the Catholic clergy seek to keep their people in ignorance," he scouts the impudent saying, in the following masterly style: "This opinion of our Churchmen seems more *orthodox* than charitable, or correct. *The Popish clergy have, in reality, less to lose by the progress of education than our own Scotch clergy.* In Catholic Germany, in France, Italy, and even Spain, the education of the common people, in reading, writing, arithmetic, music, manners, and morals, is, *at least*, as generally diffused, and as faithfully promoted, by the clerical body, as in Scotland. It is by their own advance, and not by keeping back the advance of the people, that the Popish priests of the present day, seek to keep a-head of the intellectual progress of the community. Education, is, in reality, not only *not repressed*, but *is encouraged, in the Popish Church, and is a mighty instrument in its hands, and ably used.* In every street in Rome, for in-

stance, there are, at short distances, public primary schools, for the education of the children of the lower and middle classes. Rome, with a population of 158,678 souls, has 372 public primary schools, with 482 teachers, and 14,099 children attending them. Has Edinburgh so many public schools for the instruction of those classes? I doubt it. Berlin, with a population about double that of Rome, has only 264 schools. Rome has also her university, with an average attendance of 660 students; and the Papal States, with a population of two and a-half millions, contain seven universities. Protestant Prussia, with a population of fourteen millions, has only seven....The statistical fact, that Rome has above a hundred schools more than Berlin, for a population little more than half that of Berlin, puts to flight a world of humbug....Is it asked, what is taught to the people of Rome by all these schools? Precisely what is taught at Berlin (*the most Protestant capital of the most Protestant country in the world*),—reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, languages, religious doctrine of some sort." This ample attestation, given by an enemy, should, we think, open the eyes of the veriest bigot, to this truth, that the Catholic Church loves learning, and promotes the arts and sciences.

CHAPTER XXXVI.

ON THE CHARGE OF UNCHARITABLENESS.

Q. Are Catholics uncharitable to sectarians?

A. Certainly not; since the Church teaches them to love all mankind, to pray for all, to forgive all, and to do good to all, irrespective of creed, country, or colour.

Q. Does she not teach that there is no salvation out of the Church?

A. We have already proved that there is only one true Church, as there is only *one Lord, one faith, and one baptism*, and that the Catholic Church is that one true fold. Hence it is not only not uncharitable, but very charitable in Catholics to declare to the world what is laid down in Scripture, which teaches, that sects and heresies and schisms are sins which exclude from heaven. St Paul declares, that "they that do such things, shall not inherit the kingdom of God." (Gal. v. 20, 21.)

Q. Do Catholics charge all that are apparently out of their

communion, with the crimes of heresy and schism, and consequently, exclude them from salvation?

A. No; all baptized children who die before they sin mortally, and before they embrace and believe error, are members of the true Church. Again, all those sincere people belong to the soul of the Church, who, being baptized, and believing the great fundamental truths of Christianity, and who are prevented from believing it in all its details, not by carelessness, nor temporal interest, nor human respect, nor the spirit of obstinacy, nor by malice, but simply because they never doubted, and never had sufficient means of knowing the truth, which they would embrace at once, and with gladness, could they only discover it,—all these, we say, belong to the soul of the Church, and will be saved, if they lead good lives, and do not violate God's law.

Q. *What do you mean by the soul of the Church?*

A. All those belong to the body of the Church who are openly professing Catholics; to the soul of the Church belong all such as I have above described, who, being baptized, and believing the fundamental truths of religion, are living separate from the body of the Church, not by any fault of their own, but purely by not having sufficient means to lead them into a knowledge of the whole truth.

Q. *Do Protestants expressly teach the very doctrine they unjustly blame, in us, "exclusive salvation?"*

A. Yes; the 16th Article of the *Old Confession* says, "That there is one Kirk, out of which Kirk neither life nor eternal felicity is to be hoped for." The 25th Chap. of the *Westminster Confess.* declares, "that those who profess the true religion (there can be only one religion true), with their children, are the house of God, out of which there is no ordinary possibility of salvation." The 18th of the *Church of England Articles*, declares, "that they also are to be had accursed, that presume to say, that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth." The same is the doctrine taught in the *Prot. Belgian Confess.*, 1561, and by the Synod of Dort, 1619. • The *French Prot. Catechism*, Edit. 1710, p. 283, says, "without doubt, out of the Church, there is nothing but DEATH and DAMNATION." This is extraordinary doctrine, from the lips of men, who came out of the only Church in the world a few years ago.

Q. *What do you conclude from all this?*

A. That those pretended lovers of charitable doctrine, must be very blind, who look for such in any Protestant Communion.

CHAPTER XXXVII.

THE FREE KIRK, EPISCOPALIAN ORDERS, AND
IRELAND'S CONNEXION WITH ROME.

SECTION I.

Q. *What sort of sect is that called the Free Kirk?*

A. It is an offshoot from the Presbyterian Kirk of Scotland.

Q. *In what does the Free Kirk differ from its parent?*

A. Chiefly in rejecting patronage, and in leaving it to the people to elect their own ministers.

Q. *Do they, in reality, leave the choice of the pastor to the people?*

A. There are symptoms of a schism, between the ministers and the people on this subject, which proves the system to be a very foolish one.

Q. *Why do you say this system is a foolish one?*

A. Because low as is the standard of education, amongst the ministers of the Free Kirk, it is superior to that of their followers; and, hence, they are better qualified than the mob, to choose what they term ministers.

Q. *Was not the system of the Established Kirk preferable to that of its schismatic daughter?*

A. Clearly; for whether the crown, or the educated gentleman, or the magistrate, presented, there was a chance that the selected minister should be, at least a man of education.

Q. *May not this be the case also, when the people elect?*

A. The mass of the people are ignorant, and hence not qualified to give judgment, especially when it is a question of ecclesiastical or civil learning. The ignorant are the majority, and as the majority elect, the ignorant and bigotted mountebank, will often usurp the place of learning and modesty.

Q. *Is there not something very absurd in this Free Kirk system?*

A. Yes; as well might the children in a school take upon themselves to choose their teacher, as the mob, to choose their minister. What!—the people to be taught, to choose their teacher!—the ignorant, to judge of the qualifications of the man, that is to make them wise unto salvation!—the guide of the multitude in the most important of all concerns, to be judged and guided by the men whom he has to teach the very elements of the science of salvation!

Q. *But do not the ministers judge of the qualifications of the person selected?*

A. Even if they did so, they have not the power to prevent

his election, if the people persist in their choice; either the ministers have the absolute power, to select or reject, or they have not. If they have it, then the people are mere tools; if they have it not, then they may judge as they please of the presentee; their opinion must go for nothing: the people are the parties in power; they may thrust a fool into the pulpit.

Q. Is this system of the Free Kirk scriptural?

A. It is as directly opposed to Scripture as it can possibly be. Christ, the great founder and light of his Church, did not tell the people to choose their pastors, he selected these himself; he did not tell the people to *send them forth*, he sends them forth himself: "As the Father sent me, I also send you." Matt. xx. 21. He did not order the people to sit in judgment on his preachers; no, he himself commanded them to *preach the Gospel* to all nations; and declared that those who would not hear and obey, should be reputed as heathens.

Q. What says St Paul, Rom. x. 15?

A. "How can they preach unless they be sent?"

Q. What says our blessed Saviour, John x. 1?

A. "He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief and a robber." They are "blind leaders of the blind," Matt. xv. 14.

Q. Is it not evident from St Paul, Titus ii. 5, that the above passages are applicable to the ministers of the Free Kirk and to all others, elected by the people?

A. As evident as the noon-day sun. "For this cause," says St Paul to Titus, "I left thee in Crete, that thou shouldst set in order the things that are wanting, and shouldst ordain priests in every city, as I also appointed thee." Here we see an Apostle, whose practice should be our rule, ordering a bishop whom he had himself consecrated, to ordain priests in every city. This is exactly what Christ, the great first Bishop of our souls, did, when he sent the first pastors. In this practice of the Apostles, there is no foolish mob rule.

Q. How are the Catholic clergy chosen and ordained?

A. Just as those who, in every city, were chosen and ordained by Titus.

Q. Were not the seven deacons chosen by the people, Acts vi.?

A. Yes; but this choice was made by the holy and, probably, inspired infant Church, and under the very eyes of the inspired Apostles, who had independent power to reject one and all of the seven, if the choice were bad. Besides, these seven were not priests, but the servants of the priests, appointed merely to relieve the priests of some inferior duties, such as attending the tables of the poor.

Q. What do you conclude from all you have said?

A. That no man can be a minister of Christ's Church, unless he be sent, as Christ sent the Apostles, or as St Paul sent Titus; and hence, that no minister of the Presbyterian or Episcopalian Church, is a minister of the true Church of Christ; because, in the former, ministers are sent by no bishop; and, in the latter, ministers are sent by men calling themselves bishops, but whose orders are, to say the least, doubtful, and who certainly, as a schismatical and heretical body, can have no mission or succession from the Apostles.

SECTION II.

Q. You have said that the Episcopalian Church has no Apostolical succession, how do you prove this?

A. Even they themselves, through their greatest authorities, admit this: "Let therefore our enemies judge us," Deut. xxxii. If it appears, on the best Protestant testimony, that there was no body of bishops, priests, or laics, teaching or believing exactly what the Episcopalians believe at the present day, ever known in the world till the time of Luther, then it will be evident, that there was no body to whom the bishops and ministers of the Episcopalian Church, could succeed.

Q. Have you such testimony?

A. Certainly; Calvin says: "*All the western Churches have defended Popistry.*" (R. ad Versip. p. 154.) "*Luther's separation was from all the world.*" (Ilosp. Ep. 141.) "*There was no visible company in the world free from Popery.*" (White, Defence, c. 371, p. 136.) "*The priests and all the people were drowned in Popery.*" (Bancroft, Censure 4.) "*The whole world, princes, priests, and people, were bound by oaths to the Pope.*" (Jewel, Sermon on Luke xi.) "*In times past no religion but the Papistical had place in the Church.*" (Whitaker, con. 4, q. 5, c. 3.) It must then be clear to all, that no body professing Episcopalian doctrines, existed before Luther; therefore, either the bishops of that body have no succession at all, or they have succeeded to the Catholic bishops. But the latter cannot be, because, either they teach what the Catholic bishops taught, or they do not; if they do not, then they cannot have succeeded them; if they teach what the Catholic Bishops taught, then they are Catholics,—then they believe and teach that there are seven sacraments,—that the Pope is the supreme head on earth, and the first bishop of the Church; but these great truths, taught by the Catholic bishops in every age; they repudiate; therefore they have no succession from the Catholic bishops;

therefore they have no succession from the Apostles, either directly or indirectly; therefore they have no mission of any kind; they are mere State intruders, who have entered, not by the door, but climbed over the walls into the Fold of Christ; "blind leaders of the blind."

Q. You have said, that the orders of the Episcopalian ministers are doubtful,—is this so?

A. When any converted minister wishes to be a priest, he is always reordained; whilst the Church of England never reordains any Catholic priest who passes over to her, after having been cast out of the Catholic ministry.

Q. Did Episcopals themselves always believe even in the necessity of orders?

A. No; the celebrated Dr Balguy says: "A priest or bishop can be as well made by the town-crier as by the metropolitan;" and in this, Drs Sturges, Key, Paley, and others, have agreed with him. Now, as they cared so little about orders, it is very likely, that they gave themselves little trouble, to receive any but the orders of the *town-crier*.

Q. What says Luther on this subject, Adv. fal. Nom., tom. ii. Jen. 1525?

A. "Whoever labour to extinguish the government of bishops are the beloved of God, and whoever support the government of bishops are the devil's ministers." The followers of this man would not trouble themselves to receive orders.

Q. How do you prove, that the orders of the Anglican Church are not to be depended upon?

A. Crammer, its founder, held that princes and governors, can make priests, and that no consecration is necessary in making a bishop or a priest. (Burnet's Reform.)

Q. What says Barlow, on the validity of whose consecration the validity of all the episcopal and sacerdotal orders of the Church of England rest?

A. That the king's appointment, without any order or ordination whatever, suffices to make a bishop. (Collier's Eccl. Hist. v. ii. p. 135.)

Q. Do modern ministers, then, claim holy orders?

A. Yes; but with what certainty you shall now see. The above-mentioned Barlow is said to have consecrated Parker, the *first Protestant archbishop*, from whom all Protestant orders must have been derived.

Q. Was this Barlow himself consecrated?

A. The bishops of the Church of England have been challenged, during upwards of two hundred years, to produce proof of Barlow's consecration; yet they have never accepted

the challenge, or produced this all necessary proof. Now, if Barlow was no bishop, neither could Parker be a bishop; and if Parker was not a bishop, then all the bishops and ministers of the Anglican Church are mere laymen.

Q. But granting that Barlow was a bishop, did he, in reality, consecrate Parker?

A. Here, again, we meet with doubt and almost evident forgery. The Catholic bishops of the time, challenged their adversaries to produce even the registry of Parker's consecration; yet this document was not produced till after the lapse of fifty years, when Mason, a chaplain to Archbishop Abbot, pretended to have found it amongst some old papers at Lambeth. The moment it was published, it was exclaimed against as a forgery, and its mutilated and irregular form gave almost perfect proof, that such was the case. Now, if Parker was not consecrated, neither is any one bishop or minister in the Church of England consecrated or ordained; because whatever orders they have, are derived from Parker.

Q. Besides the above arguments, which are quite sufficient to render the Anglican orders extremely doubtful, have you not another argument, which makes it very certain, that, in that Church, there are no orders at all?

A. They lost the form of ordination during about one hundred and twelve years; and, consequently, even though their bishops and ministers had true orders, before the first of these one hundred and twelve years, all such must have died out during the lapse of that period; and all, who were ordained within that period, must have been invalidly ordained, from defect of form; hence as these had no orders, so neither could they ordain others.

Q. When was the defective ordinal introduced by the Anglican Church?

A. In the reign of Edward VI., and it was restored by Elisabeth. It was used from that time till the year 1662, upwards of one hundred years.

Q. What do you conclude from all you have said?

A. That the Anglican ministers have reason to believe that they are mere laymen. When they first attempted to receive orders, very few of them believed in the necessity of ordination. Even Barlow, who consecrated the first Protestant bishop, had no faith in ordination. There is no proof that Barlow was consecrated,—there is no proof that, even if he was consecrated, he consecrated Parker; if Parker was not consecrated, then there is neither bishop nor priest in the English Church.

In fine, their whole Church existed without the valid form of ordination, during, at least more than one hundred years.

SECTION III.

Q. Have not some Anglican ministers asserted that the ancient Irish Church had no connexion with Rome?

A. Yes; but in this, as in many other attempts to prop up their Church, they are like drowning men catching at straws.

Q. Who converted England?

A. Lucius, king of the Britons, was received, at his own request, into the Church, by order of Pope Elutherius, in the year 156. By this same Pope, Eusebius and Damianus were sent to convert the Britons, whilst St Austin and his forty monks were sent, by St Gregory the Great, to convert the Anglo-Saxons; and to convert the Irish, Pope Celestine sent, first, Palladius, and, after his death, St Patrick. (Bede, Hist. Eccl. lib. i.)

Q. What were the Irish called in very ancient times?

A. They were called Scotti, or Scots. "Ireland, an island between Britain and Spain, is inhabited by a people called Scots." (P. Orosii, Hist. lib. i. cap. 2; see also, Ep. 5, Patricii ad Corot. apud Bolland; Ep. S. Columb. ad Bonifacium Papam IV.; and Bede, lib. i. Eccles. Hist.)

Q. What does Pinkerton say, Hist. of Scot., v. ii. p. 261?

A. "From the consent of all antiquity, the name Scotti belonged to the Irish alone, till the eleventh century."

Q. What says St Prosper of Aquitaine, Chron. t. i. Rer. Gal. Paris. 1738?

A. "Palladius, the first bishop of the Scotti (Irish) is sent by Pope Celestine to that country."

Q. What says St Columbanus, Ep. ad. Bonif. IV. Biblioth. Vet. Patrum. t. xii.?

A. He calls that Pope the master, the steersman, the mystic pilot of the spiritual ship. "We are Irish," he says, "receiving nothing but the Evangelic and Apostolic doctrine. The faith just as it was delivered by thee (the Pope), the successor of the Holy Apostles, is held unshaken. The praise is thine, for the purity is not from the stream, but from the fountain-head."

Q. What says the holy Abbot Cummian, anno 650, Usser. Vet. Epis. Hib. Syll. p. 13?

A. "We sent wise and humble men, as children to their mother, to Rome, to inquire as to the time for keeping Easter."

Q. But were there not Catholics in Ireland even before the time of Palladius?

A. There may have been some who, owing to the proximity

of Ireland to the Britons, converted at an earlier period, may have passed from England to that country. Still, as England was converted by Pope Elutherius, even these owed their religion to Rome. That such, however, were few, we know well, from the difficulties, even St Patrick had to contend with at a later period, in the conversion of that country.

Q. What says Usher as to the connexion of Christian Ireland with Rome?

A. About the year 360, a certain Christian priest was sent from Rome to Ireland, long before St Patrick. This priest baptized St Ailbe, yet a boy. In the year 382, Kiaran left Ireland, went to Rome, and spent twenty years in the study of Holy Writ. In 397, St Ailbe was sent by St Hilarius to the Roman Pontiff, by whom he was ordained a bishop. (Usher, Brit. Eccl. Antiq. Index Chron. p. 512.)

Q. What say the Annals of Innisfallen, Rerum Hib. Script. t. ii. in Annal. p. 12?

A. Kiaran and Declan came from Rome, bishops, to announce the faith in Ireland, in the year 402. In 412, Ailbe of Emly came from Rome, a bishop, to Ireland.

Q. What says Probus, Vita S. Patricii, Bedæ, p. 315?

A. That St Patrick went to Rome, *the head of all churches*, and there having got the Apostolic blessing, returned to convert Ireland.

SECTION IV.

Q. Has the Irish Church always acknowledged and obeyed the Holy See of Rome?

A. Most certainly. One of the canons of the Irish Church in the time of St Patrick ran thus: "If any questions arise in this island, they are to be referred to the Holy See." (Can. S. Patricii apud Wilkens Conc. Mag. Brit. t. i. p. 6.)

Q. How does St Columbanus address the Pope, Vita Columb. Scrip. Circa. 615, Mabillon?

A. "To the holy Roman Father in Christ, the chosen watchman: It pleaseth me, the lowly Columba, to send health, and to interrogate thee about Easter, according to that canticle: *'Ask thy Father, and he will show thee; thy elders, and they will tell thee.'*"

Q. What says this same saint in his first letter to Pope Gregory?

A. "I ask thee, sitting as thou dost in the chair of Peter the key-bearer, What dost thou deem as to bishops *who are ordained against the canons*—is communion to be held with them? and what should be done with monks, who, seeking perfection, leave the place where they made their first reli-

gious profession? From my heart," says the holy man to the Pope, "I yield thee due honour; mine it is to ask, thine to give Christ's behest, *the bread of true doctrine*. Forgive, oh! blessed Pope! my boldness, and pray to our common Lord for me, a vile sinner."

Q. *What does this same saint say to Pope Boniface IV.?*

A. He addresses him as "the Apostolical Father in Christ," and begs that he will direct the Irish as to the proper time to observe Easter. (Bede, lib. ii. p. 108.) In his Epist. to the same Pope, he says in his preamble: "To the beautiful head of all the churches...to the pastor of pastors: the lowliest to the HIGHEST, the last to the FIRST." Such was the idea of St Columbanus on the subject of the supremacy of St Peter's successor; such the subjection of the Irish to the Holy See.

Q. *What says St Cummán on this subject, de Mens. Pœnitent. Bib. Pat. t. xii. c. 11?*

A. That disobedience to Rome, in matters of religion, deserved ejection from the Church.

Q. *Did any Pope claim jurisdiction in Ireland?*

A. Bede tells us that Honorius, in 621 and 634, sent letters to the Irish, to correct their error as to Easter; and not only was there no opposition, but the Irish prelates sent messengers to learn the truth from the Pope's own lips: Honorius died before the matter was settled; Severinus succeeded, but gave no decision; John IV., however, the succeeding Pontiff, settled the matter, in the most dignified and authoritative manner, fixing the time for the celebration of Easter, and ordering them to eradicate from amongst them the Pelagian Heresy. (Bede, lib. ii. c. xix. p. 148.)

Q. *Did not the early Irish missionaries show their subjection to, and respect for, the Holy See, by doing homage to the Pope, and asking his permission and blessing before they preached to Pagan nations?*

A. Yes; St Deicolus, or Dichul, after building his monastery at Besançon, went to visit the shrine of the Apostles, and lay all right over his monastery and its affairs at the feet of the chief Bishop. (Bolland, Vita S. Deicoli, p. 205.) St Kilian says to his brethren: "Let us visit Rome, and after getting leave of the blessed Pope John V., let us return with the authority of the Holy See, and preach Jesus Christ to these people." (Bolland, Acta S. Kiliani, p. 613.) See a multitude of other examples in Rock's Letter to Lord John Manners, and in the learned works of the Bollandists.

Q. *What inference would you draw from what has been said?*

A. That, beyond all doubt, it was a Pope who founded the

Irish Church ; that her first bishops preached with the Apostolic blessing and permission ; that, in every dispute, they referred to Rome for a decision ; and that all great Irish missionaries, whether in Ireland or elsewhere, always sought and obtained jurisdiction from the Holy See before attempting to preach the Gospel.

Q. *What else would you add ?*

A. We defy any Protestant to point out even one Protestant bishop or minister, one Protestant conventicle, one Protestant individual, or one particle of Protestant doctrine, existing or taught in any period of Ireland's Christian history, up to the time when Protestantism was forced into that country by the sword of the already Protestantized hereditary enemies of Ireland's temporal and spiritual prosperity. Yes !—to Ireland's unhappy connexion with England we may attribute all her misfortunes. England infused the poison of heresy into that once happy and still faithful land ; England, after inflicting on her centuries of misrule, oppression, persecution, and famine, has at length reduced *that country to a desert, and this desert she calls peace*. The fairest and most faithful of England's subjects are now reduced to one of two extremes : to desert their native land ; that they may avoid starvation ; or to perish, as thousands have done during the last seven years, in the land of their birth ; and all this whilst an alien priesthood,—a priesthood without a flock,—are rioting on the spoils of the poor ; and all this, whilst England, full and bloated, looks quietly on, like the rich glutton in the Scripture, grudging even the crumbs which fall from the groaning board. Oh ! persecuted, wronged, reviled children of Ireland ! be patient yet a little—a day of retribution will come—God is just—Lazarus will yet be comforted.

GENERAL INDEX.

	Page
CHAP. I.	
Reasons for examining the Catholic religion,	9
CHAP. II.	
Rise and Progress of Protestantism,	16
CHAP. III.	
Sec. 1. Reformation not the work of God; Luther not a man of God.—Sec. 2. His undertaking not from God.—Sec. 3. Means adopted, not from God.—Sec. 4. Calvin, not sent by God.—Sec. 5. Carlostad, &c., not men of God.—Sec. 6. Cranmer the enemy of God.—Sec. 7. Knox, no emissary from heaven,	24
CHAP. IV.	
Sec. 1. On faith, fundamentals and non-fundamentals.—Sec. 2. Protestants have not Divine faith.—Sec. 3. They must doubt as to the canon of Scripture.—Sec. 4. They must doubt their translations.—Sec. 5. They must doubt as to the true sense of these translations,	43
CHAP. V.	
Sec. 1. The Socinian rule of faith.—Sec. 2. Rule of Anabaptist, Methodists, Quakers, &c.—Sec. 3. Lutheran and Calvinistic rule.—Sec. 4. Written word, in neither Testament, considered the only rule.—Sec. 5. Necessary truths not found in Scripture.—Sec. 6, 7, 8. Protestants do not follow the Scripture as their only rule,	52
CHAP. VI.	
Sec. 1. True rule—the teaching of an infallible Church.—Sec. 2. God's word, in tradition as well as in Scripture.—Sec. 3. True rule of faith proved from Old Testament.—Sec. 4. Same, proved from the New Testament.—Sec. 5. Interpretation of texts quoted, justified; right reason supports an infallible Church,	70
CHAP. VII.	
Sec. 1. The true Church has existed <i>visibly</i> and <i>unceasingly</i> since her foundation.—Sec. 2. These two properties exist only in the Catholic Church.—Sec. 3. No Protestantism before Luther.—Sec. 4. True Church one; the Catholic Church is so, the Protestant not so.—Sec. 5. True Church holy; the Catholic Church is so, the Protestant not so.—Sec. 6. True Church universal; the Catholic Church is so, the Protestant not so.—Sec. 7. True Church Apostolical; the Catholic Church is so, the Protestant not so,	86

	Page
CHAP. VIII.	
Sec. 1. Jesus the Head of all; appointed Peter with supreme authority.—Sec. 2. Peter's successors succeeded to his rank and supremacy.—Sec. 3. To say the Pope is Antichrist is antiscritptural insolence, ...	103
CHAP. IX.	
Sec. 1. Councils, general and provincial; the former infallible.—Sec. 2. General Councils enumerated, &c.,	110
CHAP. X.	
On Heresy, ...	113
CHAP. XI.	
Sec. 1. Obedience to the Church.—Sec. 2. Why meats are forbidden, &c.—Sec. 3. The Apostles established Lent, &c. ...	117
CHAP. XII.	
Sec. 1. Ceremonies, they are Scriptural.—Sec. 2. Holy Water, Sign of the Cross, &c.—Sec. 3. Vestments, parts of Mass, explained.—Sec. 4. Mass in Latin, ...	122
CHAP. XIII.	
Sec. 1. On Jesus Christ.—Sec. 2. Catholics glorify him more than Protestants, ...	129
CHAP. XIV.	
Sec. 1. The Blessed Virgin—the Blessed Trinity honoured her.—Sec. 2. St Luke on the Catholic side.—Sec. 3. All antiquity in our favour, ...	132
CHAP. XV.	
Sec. 1. The saints and angels know our wants.—Sec. 2. They pray for us; we may honour and invoke them,	138
CHAP. XVI.	
Sec. 1. Images.—Sec. 2. Pilgrimages.—Sec. 3. Relics,	142
CHAP. XVII.	
Sec. 1. Justification, faith, and works.—Sec. 2. Merit.—Sec. 3. Christ satisfied for sin, ...	145
CHAP. XVIII.	
Mortal and Venial Sin, ...	151
CHAP. XIX.	
Indulgences, ...	153
CHAP. XX.	
Prayers for the Dead, ...	155
CHAP. XXI.	
Sec. 1. Purgatory, proved from Old Testament.—Sec. 2. Proved from the New Testament—Sec. 3. Proved from the Fathers, ...	157
CHAP. XXII.	
Sec. 1. Seven Sacraments.—Sec. 2. Baptism, ...	161

	CHAP. XXIII.	Page
Confirmation, established by Scripture and Fathers, ...		164
	CHAP. XXIV.	
Sec. 1. Holy Eucharist—general belief in real presence.		
Sec. 2. Promise of Christ before the institution.—Sec.		
3. Conduct of disciples and Jews.—Sec 4. Christ		
fulfils his promise.—Sec. 5. St Paul teaches real pre-		
sence.—Sec. 6. Dr Clarke replied to.—Sec. 7. Tran-		
substantiation.—Sec. 8. Christ permanently present		
in the sacrament,		166
	CHAP. XXV.	
Sec. 1. Communion under one kind.—Sec. 2. Objections		
answered,		187
	CHAP. XXVI.	
Sec. 1. The Mass, a real sacrifice.—Sec. 2. Ends of this		
sacrifice—its antiquity—offered for the living and		
the dead, &c.		191
	CHAP. XXVII.	
Sec. 1. Penance a real sacrament.—Sec. 2. Confession		
proved from Old Testament.—Sec. 3. Confession		
proved from New Testament and early Fathers, ...		196
	CHAP. XXVIII.	
Extreme Unction, proved by Scripture and antiquity, ...		202
	CHAP. XXIX.	
Holy Orders, proved by Scripture and antiquity, ...		204
	CHAP. XXX.	
Matrimony, proved by Scripture and Fathers,		206
	CHAP. XXXI.	
On Persecution,		209
	CHAP. XXXII.	
On the Inquisition,		214
	CHAP. XXXIII.	
On reading the Scriptures,		217
	CHAP. XXXIV.	
On Religious Orders,		218
	CHAP. XXXV.	
On the charge of Ignorance,		219
	CHAP. XXXVI.	
On the charge of Uncharitableness,		223
	CHAP. XXXVII.	
Free Kirk, Episcopalian mission and orders, and Ireland's		
connexion with Rome,		225

PROTESTANT TESTIMONY.

“ Mr Keenan knows, much better than we can tell him, the mysteries of priestcraft : and, judging from his work, we should have no hesitation in pronouncing him admirably skilled in that ingenious science which aims at making the worse appear the better reason. In justice to Mr Keenan, we must acknowledge that we shall not easily find, within so narrow a compass, a more cunning or plausible apology for the distinguishing peculiarities of Romanism. The “ Controversial Catechism ” is a masterly instance of special pleading, and is admirably fitted, both to strengthen the attachment of Catholics to their own creed, and to bring over to that mode of thinking no inconsiderable number of those who, calling themselves Protestants, are yet but partially informed as to the reason of their hope.”—*Macphail's Ecclesiastical Magazine*.

Approbations of the Work.

BY THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP CARRUTHERS.

A concise summary of arguments, authorities, and proofs, in support of the doctrines, institutions, and practices of the Catholic Church, is here presented in a very convenient form, as an additional antidote against the unceasing effusions of antagonistic Ignorance and Misrepresentation. The believer will be hereby instructed and confirmed in his faith, and the sincere searcher after truth will here find a lucid path opened to conduct him to its sanctuary. There is much important matter condensed in these unpretending pages. The work, I trust, will meet with the notice it deserves, and the good be thus effected which the zealous and talented author has had in view in its publication.

✠ ANDREW, BISHOP OF CERAMIS.

Vicar Apostolic of Eastern Scotland.

Edinburgh, 10th April, 1846.

BY THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP GILLIS.

I have much pleasure in adding my name to the above Approbation by my Venerable Predecessor, and in earnestly recommending the study of the **CONTROVERSIAL CATECHISM** to the Faithful of the Eastern District of Scotland. A class of Anti-Catholic Evangelists, i. now fast multiplying around us, whose principal "Message," it would appear, is unto hungry stomachs; and against them, of course, all argument is vain. But there are many, it is to be hoped, sincere in their pursuit of Truth; and to all such, the **CONTROVERSIAL CATECHISM** must ever prove a welcome and highly useful guide.

The fact of nine thousand copies having already been exhausted in two Editions in this country, besides a third Edition printed in America, is evidence sufficient of the favour with which the Catechism has been received by the Catholic Public; and, in truth, it would be difficult to find a work of religious instruction, in matter so condensed, and in price so moderate, better fitted to qualify its attentive reader for "being ready always to satisfy every one that asketh him a reason for the hope that is in him." I congratulate the Reverend Author on his Work, and the District on its Author.

✠ JAMES, BISHOP OF LIMYRA,

*Vicar Apostolic of the Eastern District
in Scotland.*

Edinburgh, 14th November, 1853.

Approbations of the Work.

BY THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP KYLE.

I have read, with much pleasure, a Work entitled "Controversial Catechism, by the Rev. Stephen Keenan." As it contains a well-reasoned defence of the Catholic faith, and clear and satisfactory solutions of the usual objections adduced by separatists, I deem that the study of it will be most useful to all Catholics; and, therefore, I earnestly recommend it to the Faithful in the Northern District of Scotland.

✠ JAS. KYLE, V.A. N.D.S.

Preshome, 15th April, 1846.

BY THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP MURDOCH.

Glasgow, 19th November, 1853.

MY DEAR MR. KEENAN,

I am exceedingly delighted to learn that a Third Edition of your excellent "CONTROVERSIAL CATECHISM" is about to be printed. You request my approbation of this New Edition. Most willingly and most heartily do I give it. But it is really altogether unnecessary; for the work has amply approved itself. The rapid exhaustion of the two last editions, is more than sufficient proof of the value and worth of the Catechism. I know not, indeed, if we possess a volume better adapted to the wants of the time; whilst its price brings it within the reach of all, even the poorest classes of society; and its size is well suited to those—and they are very many—who have little time to read large books. As long as the CONTROVERSIAL CATECHISM is to be had, it is entirely the fault of all Catholics—be their rank however humble—if they be not ready on all occasions to give a reason of the faith and hope that are in them. I am, REV. DEAR SIR, yours sincerely in Christ,

✠ JOHN MURDOCH, V.A. W.D.

The REV. STEPHEN KEENAN, Dundee.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

DISCUSSIONS on the various questions of religion, have ever been and still are matters of inevitable necessity; because Christianity and its dogmas have ever been and still are impugned, by those victims of passion, prejudice, and error—the schismatic, heretic, and infidel. The true minister of Jesus Christ is thus compelled to make religious controversy an important part of his studies, as it is only by this mean he can, with the help of God's grace, bring back these unfortunate wanderers to the fold of Christ. If angry feelings are sometimes engendered by these discussions, the fault lies with those who first raised the standard of rebellion, against the teaching of the lawful pastors, whom Christ commissioned to feed his lambs and his sheep, with the bread of life and the Word of God. To elucidate truth, is the object of free discussion; and to all who are *properly qualified* for the task, ample scope should be given. Catholics, as regards their doctrines, court publicity; because they are fully aware, that the more these are tried and examined, the stronger will be the conviction of their truth in the mind of the sincere inquirer. Of this, ample proof will be found in the multitude of late conversions,—conversions, be it observed, not of the vulgar and illiterate, but of the brightest ornaments of the age, not of the interested and worldly, but of men who proved themselves ready to sacrifice every worldly advantage for the sake of conscience and truth,—conversions, not of the victim of passion, as is the case when a stray Catholic becomes Protestant, but of men whose minds are pure and their hearts chaste, whose high and spotless morality is beyond all suspicion. Such are the men, who, bursting the fetters in

which they had been hitherto bound, and tearing to pieces the thick veil of early prejudice by which the Protestant world is blindfolded, have boldly dared to act upon the Protestant principle of examining for themselves; and, having made that examination, not without hearty commendations of themselves to Heaven, have, of late, added to the glory of the Redeemer by their piety and learning, and, by their numbers, extended the pale of His true Church.

On the subject of religious controversy, numerous works of deep research and intrinsic merit have of late issued from the press: most of these, however, are so diffuse and expensive as to render them useless to the humble Catholic and Protestant artisan, who, though anxious in their search after truth, have neither time nor education to enable them to read, nor money to procure, elaborate and expensive publications; others, again, are so compendious, and the arguments so abridged, that, when put into the hands of a superficial Protestant, they fail to produce conviction. Some others, in fine, there are, the scope of which is rather to instruct Catholics in the faith and practices of their religion, than to disabuse the Protestant mind of its prejudices and its errors. Amongst these works of real talent and merit, something seemed to the Writer of the following pages to be still wanting, viz. : an epitome of controversy in a concise and cheap form, comprising the principal arguments on the various questions most commonly controverted, combining perspicuity with brevity and cheapness, that it might be within the reach of all Catholics who are called to give a reason for the faith that is in them, and of all sincerely inquiring Protestants, whose occupations and circumstances preclude the possibility of recourse to more learned, more voluminous, and expensive works.

Whether this desideratum be supplied by the following little Work, the public will soon determine. The plan and a portion of the groundwork are taken from a small controversial treatise by Father Scheffmacher, a German Jesuit, who held the chair of controversy at Strasburg about a century ago. It was at

first the intention of the Writer to give only a translation of Scheffmacher's Catechism, but, after a careful examination of it, he found some important articles treated with such brevity, that it was necessary to remodel and extend them, whilst others of vital interest were scarcely touched at all; indeed, such were the changes and additions which the Writer was obliged to make, that the present may be considered an almost entirely new work. The Writer acknowledges his obligations, in some instances, to several Continental as well as English Divines; and trusts that an indulgent public will find, in the solidity of the matter, an apology for all defects in manner and style. He also takes this opportunity of expressing his gratitude to the eminent Catholic Prelate to whom the Work, for the sake of security, was submitted; and hopes that nothing will be found in it unworthy of his Lordship's patronage. If, in fine, this publication promote the cause of Religion and Truth;—if, by being put in the hands of the neophyte, it lighten the burden of his brother Clergymen in the matter of controversial instruction;—if it aid in dispelling error,—in carrying conviction to the mind,—in bringing back to the unity of the one fold, some of the many who have wandered from it;—the Writer will consider his labours amply rewarded.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

THE rapid sale of the former edition,—its approbation by many Clergymen in Scotland and by several in Ireland and England,—the fact of its appearing in a very elegant American edition, approved by the Right Rev. Dr Hughes of New York, and by the American Catholic Clergy and Catholic press,—combined with the antipathy of modern religionists to its publication or circulation, and the unwilling testimony wrung from them as to its efficacy in supporting truth,—all these motives, strengthened by a desire to put down error and establish truth, have induced the Author to give to the public a second edition. Busied with the various duties of a heavy and important Mission, he regrets that circumstances have not allowed him to make this edition more worthy of his readers and patrons. He has, however, made alterations and important additions, which, with an improved arrangement of the matter, may, he trusts, render the Work more generally useful.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION.

THE hard-working Clergy and persecuted Catholics of Great Britain have now given the CONTROVERSIAL CATECHISM a decided approbation. The demand for it in each of the three kingdoms has satisfied its Author that his labour has answered some good purpose. An Edition of three thousand copies, and one of six thousand, have been disposed of in a comparatively short time; and as the demand continues, a Third Edition is now imperatively required. Having the high approbation of Archbishop HUGHES, the Right Rev. Drs KYLE and CARRUTHERS, as well as the approval of the Right Rev. Dr GILLIS, and the Right Rev. Dr MURDOCH, the Author begs leave to present again his little Work to that kind public, which has honoured him with such extensive previous patronage.

The high approbation above-mentioned proves that the CONTROVERSIAL CATECHISM is not without its merits,—that it is calculated to do some little good. If so, there never was a time in which such helps were more necessary. Every thing that the enemy of salvation can do, is now being done to obscure truth, to substitute falsehood in its place. Infidelity is making desperate efforts to render us at once disloyal to our Queen and to our God. Exeter-Hall heresy is making a *dying exertion* to slay Popery. The lying tract, the corrupted English Bible, as well as the poor, dry, heartless, faithless, hopeless, and charity-less ranting of English and Scottish itinerant quacks in religion, are all, all, employed, armed with every *mean* that earth or hell can supply, to subvert the

faith, not of the rich and learned, for that would be hopeless, but of the poor, unlettered, and defenceless Catholic. You never hear of their feats amongst our educated Catholic population; but how often, oh! how often do we hear of what they call the triumphs they obtain by victories won, armed with a soup tureen in one hand, and a corrupted Bible in the other. They attempt not to convert or reconvert their own ministers, who have become Catholic, because they know they would not succeed; but they proceed in whole bodies to *convert* the poor widow, who has no bread, and the poor orphan, who has no home.

If ever, therefore, there was a time in which the Catholic Pastor should be vigilant, it is the present time. If there ever was a moment in which Catholics, poor Catholics, ought to guard against the wiles of the enemy, the present is that moment. It is, then, with great confidence, that the Author sends forth his little book in such perilous times, trusting in God, that it may do much good, especially amongst the poor, who, sought for anxiously by the heretic, the schismatic, and the infidel, are every moment in imminent peril. May God watch over his own poor Catholic children, and make this Work an instrument in His hands, to strengthen their faith, and enable them to struggle triumphantly against the enemies of their salvation.

DUNDEE,
Feast of all Saints, 1853.

